

**SEARCH**

*The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics*

7311 Greenhaven Drive, Suite 145 • Sacramento, California 95831  
(916) 392-2550 • fax: (916) 392-8440 • internet: [www.search.org](http://www.search.org)

---

# Technical Assistance Report

---

## State of Idaho

### Justice Information Integration Planning

**Site Visit:** August 12-13, 2002

**Report Submitted:** October 7, 2002

**Project Team:** Lawrence P. Webster

# Contents

<b>I. Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Background .....	1
Observations and Analysis.....	1
Recommendations .....	2
Conclusion .....	3
<b>II. Introduction and Request for Assistance.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>III. Background.....</b>	<b>6</b>
The Idaho Justice Enterprise .....	6
Integration Background .....	10
<b>IV. Observations and Analysis.....</b>	<b>15</b>
1. The current organizational structure of the justice enterprise is favorable for integration. ....	15
2. The current political environment is both positive and negative with respect to supporting the integration of systems. ....	15
3. Technological capabilities in the justice community are adequate to begin integration planning. ....	16
<b>V. Recommendations .....</b>	<b>17</b>
1. The state of Idaho should create a governance structure to guide integration efforts. ....	17
2. Under the direction of the policy group, the state of Idaho should prepare a high- level strategic plan to guide integration efforts.....	21
3. The state of Idaho should conduct an integration needs assessment and a readiness assessment. ....	26
4. The state of Idaho should conduct an assessment of existing technology in the justice environment. ....	26
5. The state of Idaho should conduct a thorough analysis of information exchange between local, state, and federal justice organizations. ....	27
6. The state of Idaho should develop standards for the exchange of information between justice system organizations. ....	29
7. The state of Idaho should review legal and policy issues surrounding the electronic exchange of information. ....	30
8. The state of Idaho should develop an architecture for integration of the justice enterprise. ....	31

9. The state of Idaho should create a plan to conduct an aggressive communication and educational initiative to build support for integration at all levels of the justice system. ....	33
10. Following the completion of second-stage planning activities, the state of Idaho should prepare a list of integration projects and priorities. ....	34
<b>VI. Conclusion .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Appendix A: About SEARCH, the Integration Technical Assistance Program, and the Project Team .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix B: Technical Assistance Project Participants and Documents Reviewed</b>	<b>39</b>
Technical Assistance Project Participants .....	40
Documents Reviewed .....	41
<b>Appendix C: SEARCH Integration Strategic Planning Template .....</b>	<b>42</b>
SEARCH Integration Strategic Planning Template .....	43
1. Introduction .....	43
2. Integration Definition: Establishing a Common Understanding .....	43
3. Governance Structure .....	46
4. Charter .....	47
5. Mission .....	48
6. Vision .....	49
7. Values .....	51
8. Strategic Issues .....	53
9. Goals .....	54
10. Operational Requirements .....	56
11. Plan for Stage II Planning Activities .....	58
12. Integration Needs and Readiness Assessment .....	59
13. Review of Current Technology Environment .....	60
14. Analysis of Information Exchange .....	60
15. Standards Development .....	61
16. Information Policy .....	61
17. Integration Architecture .....	61
18. Communication Planning .....	62
19. Prioritized Project List .....	62

20. Strategic Plan Implementation.....	62
21. Strategic Management of Integration.....	63
<b>Appendix D: Integration Planning Materials from Other Jurisdictions .....</b>	<b>64</b>
Integration Planning Materials from Other Jurisdictions .....	65
<b>Appendix E: The Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM) .....</b>	<b>142</b>
The Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM).....	143
<b>Appendix F: Integration Models .....</b>	<b>153</b>
Integration Models .....	154
<b>Appendix G: Integration Needs Assessment and Integration Readiness Assessment .....</b>	<b>159</b>
Integration Needs Assessment .....	160
Integration Readiness Assessment .....	162
<b>Appendix H: Sample Integration Newsletter .....</b>	<b>163</b>

## **I. Executive Summary**

---

This integration technical assistance project is focused on the need to plan for justice system technology at the enterprise level. It should contribute to efforts to raise awareness among criminal justice executives of the business case for integration and of the national scope of this initiative. The primary objectives are to (1) assess the status of justice system integration in Idaho, (2) identify barriers to strategic planning and the integration of justice information, and (3) make specific recommendations for making progress toward strategic planning and coordination.

### **Background**

Idaho justice organizations are experienced in the use of technology applications to support their work. While some have been more successful than others in developing, implementing, and maintaining these software systems, there is a good foundation in place for improved information sharing and greater collaboration in justice systems operations.

While limited success is apparent with respect to the integration of justice information, more extensive data sharing will be hindered more than helped by these experiences. Because there is no enterprise view of justice system business processes and automation, and no planning at the policy level, attempts to connect systems electronically are leading justice organizations down divergent, irreconcilable paths. More technology deployment and more interface development, without strategic planning to guide these efforts, only will exacerbate the situation and make future progress more difficult.

Integration has been defined as the ability to access and share critical information electronically at key decision points throughout the justice enterprise. Information is essential to the operation of the criminal justice system. In order to control crime, protect the public, enforce the law, maintain order in society, preserve individual rights, and treat offenders appropriately, each action and decision must be documented carefully.

The exchange of that information is equally important, since a variety of organizations that play different roles in the justice process are mutually interdependent. Without complete, accurate, and timely information, decision-makers cannot make correct choices. Integration is the automation of this information exchange process. It is the connection of systems internally, horizontally, and vertically in the criminal justice process so that information can move from place to place almost instantly, providing information to decision-makers in a timely manner, reducing error, and eliminating the cost of human involvement.

### **Observations and Analysis**

The state of Idaho is well behind most other states in addressing the integration issue, but is in a better position than most to move forward rapidly. The following conclusions relating to the current state of technology use in Idaho are based on interviews with justice officials.

- 1. The current organizational structure of the justice enterprise is favorable for integration.**
- 2. The current political environment is both positive and negative with respect to supporting the integration of systems.**
- 3. Technological capabilities in the justice community are adequate to begin integration planning.**

## **Recommendations**

Based on the observations and analysis, we offer the following recommendations to the state of Idaho:

- 1. The state of Idaho should create a governance structure to guide integration efforts.**
- 2. Under the direction of the policy group, the state of Idaho should prepare a high-level strategic plan to guide integration efforts.**
- 3. The state of Idaho should conduct an integration needs assessment and a readiness assessment.**
- 4. The state of Idaho should conduct an assessment of existing technology in the justice environment.**
- 5. The state of Idaho should conduct a thorough analysis of information exchange between local, state, and federal justice organizations.**
- 6. The state of Idaho should develop standards for the exchange of information between justice system organizations.**
- 7. The state of Idaho should review legal and policy issues surrounding the electronic exchange of information.**
- 8. The state of Idaho should develop an architecture for integration of the justice enterprise.**
- 9. The state of Idaho should create a plan to conduct an aggressive communication and educational initiative to build support for integration at all levels of the justice system.**
- 10. Following the completion of second-stage planning activities, the state of**

**Idaho should prepare a list of integration projects and priorities.**

## **Conclusion**

Idaho is behind most other states in integrating its justice information systems. While some interfaces have been developed, the lack of a guiding methodology has resulted in varying approaches. The cost and complexity of these customized interfaces developed in isolation will be fully realized as future progress inevitably stalls.

The most essential key to success with integration is to have the right people at the table — leaders of justice organizations — working together and directing the activity of specialized groups assembled to lay the foundation for an enterprise approach to doing business.

The strategic planning process will unite the justice community in the pursuit of a common vision and goals. It will provide a forum for effective communication, cooperation, and collaboration. Together, justice organizations will accomplish much more than they can accomplish individually.

## II. Introduction and Request for Assistance

---

Mr. Robert Taylor, Manager of the Bureau of Criminal Identification for the Idaho State Police, submitted a technical assistance request to SEARCH on May 31, 2002. In the request, Mr. Taylor described the state of Idaho's integration efforts as follows:

"Criminal justice agencies in Idaho are involved in data sharing projects and efforts to integrate justice information systems. Commendable cooperation among criminal justice agencies is taking place at the project level. Integration initiatives, however, are not coordinated pursuant to a strategic vision or goal. This is because the state lacks a strategic plan for integrating justice information.

"To date, the state has not been able to launch a serious strategic planning effort. In addition, there is a general lack of awareness among the state's policy makers regarding the potential benefits of a strategic approach to justice system integration."

Mr. Taylor suggested the following scope for the technical assistance project:

"The team mentioned above believes that an outside assessment of the barriers to strategic planning, with recommendations for corrective actions, would benefit efforts to develop a meaningful statewide plan for integration."

"The primary objectives of the assistance would be to (1) assess very generally the state of justice system integration in Idaho, (2) identify barriers to strategic planning and the integration of justice information, and (3) make specific recommendations for making progress toward strategic planning and coordination.

"It is also anticipated that the technical assistance project will contribute to efforts at raising the awareness among criminal justice executives of the business case for integration and national scope of this initiative."

Larry Webster was assigned to conduct the technical assistance project. The site visit was held on August 12 – 13, 2002. During the site visit, and on several follow-up telephone calls, Mr. Webster spoke with representatives of most of



Idaho's justice system organizations.

A follow-up site visit was held on October 16, 2002, at which justice system officials reviewed this report, provided feedback on its content, and discussed how it should be implemented in Idaho.

### III. Background

---

#### The Idaho Justice Enterprise

This section provides a brief summary of the applications and electronic interfaces in use in each of the major justice organizations. Agency representatives also provided insights into issues that must be addressed as the state moves forward with an integration initiative. The brief nature of the technical assistance site visit precluded any opportunity for interviews with individual local agencies.

##### *Idaho State Police*

The ISP supports criminal history, central sex offender registry, missing persons clearinghouse, uniform crime reporting, automated fingerprint identification system, ILETS training and compliance, misdemeanor warrants, hot files, protection orders, and no-contact order databases. They are also the state's connecting point to national databases through NCIC and participate in the WIN regional identification network.

The ISP has network connectivity throughout the state through ILETS. Most justice organizations have or could have direct access to information stored at the ISP. The ISP receives most fingerprint information electronically through a number of LiveScan devices at nine key locations throughout the state, including about three-fourths of all fingerprints taken in the state. It receives electronic dispositions from the courts via diskette. Little prosecutor information makes its way to the ISP in any format.

Staff from the Idaho State Police noted a number of issues concerning integration:

- low awareness, understanding, and recognition of the importance of integration to the success of the justice enterprise;
- with technical and funding issues added in, integration may be tough to sell in Idaho;
- education is important to success;
- justice officials need to hear why it is important first, before they hear how they should do it;
- leadership also is important—an agency or individual must step forward and be the champion of the integration initiative; and
- many organizations are willing to participate, but not to lead.

### ***Idaho Prosecuting Attorney's Association***

(To be completed following the telephone interview.)

### ***Idaho Judicial Branch***

ISTARS is the main application supported by the judicial branch. It is a trial court case management system that operates in all 44 counties, though Ada County uses its own system for criminal and juvenile cases. It operates on an IBM AS/400 platform, but is currently being upgraded to a client/server environment. The courts also operate an appellate case management system, called ATS.

ISTARS was implemented in a decentralized environment, with no central repository of information. Any request for court information must be channeled to individual counties. The courts are in the process of constructing a data warehouse that will house information from all of the counties, making access to court information more practical.

The courts receive no information electronically. They provide traffic, criminal, juvenile, and Fish and Game disposition information to the appropriate agencies periodically on diskette. Executive branch agencies in some larger counties have ISTARS inquiry access capability.

Court representatives outlined a number of issues that face the state in pursuing integration. The courts can play a strong role in introducing justice system standards. They established a uniform citation by court rule; similar work is needed for no-contact and protection orders. The central direction and cohesive policy development needed to make integration work in the state will be, in many ways, a new experience in Idaho. Working relationships between state and local units of government are not traditionally strong. In Idaho, geography is more of a challenge than volume of work. A relatively small population is spread over a large geographical area, making the economics of integrating the justice enterprise an issue. Also, there is little recognized need at the policy level to integrate justice information.

### ***Idaho Department of Correction***

The Department of Correction operates a centralized records system that is used statewide. The current legacy application does not support all aspects of the department's operations and must be replaced; the department is trying to acquire a system developed by the state of Utah. They are also planning to migrate from their obsolete networking environment, as well.

The Department of Correction has an interface with ILETS. They are working to push data to the ISP electronically, rather than on paper. There is a great, unmet demand for access to DOC information at present from a variety of agencies, and they are working to make it available. For example, prisoner transportation issues with local jails currently are worked out by e-mail and fax.

Issues cited by Department of Correction staff include:

- governance and politics;
- the need for a champion for the integration cause;
- funding;
- lack of infrastructure;
- information policy issues; and
- the inability of counties to participate.

They stressed that the CJIS organization must be independent of existing government organizations if it is to succeed.

### ***Office of the Governor***

Kathy Ruffalo, from the governor's office, raised a couple of good issues related to integration. First, experience with other programs indicates that it will be very important to work closely with local agencies. They must be involved in the process early because they are essential to success.

The second issue relates to funding. The economic climate in Idaho, as with other states, is not good at present. The integration effort must be launched without expectation of state support in the near term. It will be important to seek grant funds and to rely on existing staff to get started.

### ***Idaho Department of Juvenile Corrections***

The Department of Juvenile Corrections operates one major tracking system, called IJOS. It is Oracle-based and runs in a client/server environment. The department will be developing a web interface for the system in the near future, allowing easier access to the application from remote locations.

The department has automated interfaces with county-based juvenile probation offices in six counties, and with juvenile detention systems in three of those six. Currently the interfaces provide only minimal identification, probation officer, and contact information, but plans are to expand the information captured to include court history, placement history, etc. The system in use in the six counties is called JCMS. The product has been customized for each location, so there are minor differences in the interface from location to location.

Efforts are currently underway to develop an interface with a system being developed in Twin Falls by a different vendor. The department is optimistic that this interface will be easier to develop, since the vendor is building the system using information obtained from department staff. The department also could benefit greatly from interfaces with the judicial branch and law enforcement.

The Department of Juvenile Corrections noted two issues concerning integration. First, because tracking software is customized for the county in which it is used, it makes the development and maintenance of electronic interfaces much more complex. Standards would help resolve this problem. Second, security is essential in an integration project. Being able to use the internet as a communication mechanism would save time, money, and effort, but the justice system must have confidence that there will be no unauthorized access to any of the information being transmitted.

### ***Idaho Department of Transportation***

The Department of Transportation operates numerous systems; those most relevant to the justice community are driver's license, motor vehicle registration, commercial drivers, permitting, and accident reports.

The department exchanges electronic information with a wide variety of justice and non-justice organizations. They provide digital photos for the sex offender registry, concealed weapon permits, and ID cards. Other organizations with which the Department of Transportation exchanges information include the Department of Health and Welfare, U.S. Internal Revenue Service, ILETS, Social Security Administration, Selective Service, and other states. They receive traffic conviction, revocation, suspension, and proof of payment information from the courts on diskette, and documents from law enforcement concerning failed drug and alcohol tests. They provide source lists for jury pools and send registration information to a national motor vehicle program to help prevent title fraud. They receive accident reports from law enforcement and provide information to ports of entry. While not all of this information is sent or received electronically from all locations, the department recognizes the benefits of integration and is pursuing opportunities to conduct more and more business in this way.

Integration issues mentioned by Department of Transportation staff include cross-referencing insurance information with motor vehicle files and security checks for individuals transporting hazardous materials.

### ***Idaho Department of Administration***

The Information Technology Resource Management Council (ITRMC) functions in the same role as a chief information officer in many states, except that it lacks budgetary authority. It consists of 16 governor-appointed members, who represent all three branches of government, with local government and private industry representatives.

The ITRMC plays several important roles that are relevant to the integration initiative. It is currently the only statewide forum for discussing technology issues at the policy level. It is responsible for IDANET, an initiative to facilitate broadband communications support to all counties of the state. It also provided exposure to integration at its recent E-government Boot Camp, to which local justice officials were invited.

ITRMC can provide leadership to the integration initiative, since many of the key players in justice technology policy are on the council and because it has the requisite statutory authority.

### ***Local Law Enforcement***

It was not possible to interview representatives of local law enforcement agencies during the site visit, so information concerning automation at this level is incomplete and second-hand. In general, what automation exists in local law enforcement was acquired or developed internally. There are some electronic interfaces between systems and some limited integration in a few counties. While all would benefit from integration, it is not known at this point how willing local agencies will be to participate in a statewide integration effort.

### ***Local Detention Facilities***

It was not possible to interview representatives of local detention facilities during the site visit, so information concerning automation at this level also is incomplete and second-hand. In general, automation in local jails exists only in the larger locations. Ada County, the largest county in the state, has worked without success to integrate its jail software with other county justice agencies. A number of juvenile detention facilities are providing limited electronic information to the state Department of Juvenile Corrections.

## **Integration Background<sup>1</sup>**

Integration of criminal justice information systems has become a high priority of state and local government throughout the nation. This desire to integrate systems has been driven by several factors, including growing user needs, greater public expectations, improved information and security technology, and major federal initiatives.

User needs have grown as the quality and capabilities of internal automation and other technology tools have improved. As agencies experience success and as more sophisticated systems become available, staff becomes more confident and desires to perform more functions with technology.

Because technology is reaching into many new areas, the public is becoming more comfortable with it and is increasing its expectations. More access to criminal history records for non-justice purposes is being sought and granted, and the public, in general, seems to believe that criminal justice information systems already are integrated.

Information and security technologies have progressed to the point that concern about risk has diminished significantly. Internet communications protocols and

---

<sup>1</sup> This section is adapted from *North Dakota Integrated Justice Planning*, a technical assistance report prepared by SEARCH in January 2001.

user interfaces have become de facto standards for technology of all types. Data warehousing, middleware, and standard application architectures also have contributed to new opportunities for applying technology tools to the advantage of the criminal justice system.

Two major federal initiatives also are driving state and local governments toward integration. The Crime Identification Technology Act (CITA) has provided millions of dollars of direct and indirect support for integration at the state level. The creation of the Global Criminal Justice Information Network, an advisory committee to the United States Attorney General, has brought representatives of executive and judicial branch organizations together to discuss and begin to set standards for information exchange.

### ***Definition of Integration***

Integration has been defined as the ability to access and share critical information electronically at key decision points throughout the justice enterprise.<sup>2</sup> In today's terms, integration does not mean forcing all criminal justice agencies to use a common information system or to keep all of their data in the same place. It also does not mean opening up sensitive databases to the public or to other organizations. Integration is not sharing everything, nor is it necessarily sharing information with other agencies that has not been shared in the past. There are a variety of architectural models for approaching integration, none of which restrict internal uses of technology or alter the delicate balances that exist in the justice system.

Information is essential to the operation of the criminal justice system. In order to control crime, protect the public, enforce the law, maintain order in society, preserve individual rights, and treat offenders appropriately, each action and decision must be documented carefully. The exchange of that information is equally important, since a variety of organizations that play different roles in the justice process are mutually interdependent. Without complete, accurate, and timely information, decision-makers cannot make correct choices.

Most criminal justice agencies do a good job of managing information internally. They have created business processes and technology tools that help them do their work more effectively and economically. The problem is that these organizations have created these systems in isolation and they do not match up with one another. As long as data is exchanged on paper, and as long as the telephone and radio are available to clear up misunderstandings, information can be moved from one organization to another. The problem is that this takes a tremendous amount of time, the labor costs are excessive, and the process is rife with error. Because of the increasing mobility of criminals and growing volume and complexity of

---

<sup>2</sup> For a more extensive discussion of the definition of integration, see the SEARCH publication: *Integration in the Context of Justice Information Systems: a Common Understanding* at [http://www.search.org/integration/about\\_integration.asp#publications](http://www.search.org/integration/about_integration.asp#publications).

cases, manual data exchange cannot deliver information to decision-makers quickly enough to make a difference.

Integration is the automation of this information exchange process. It is the connection of systems internally, horizontally, and vertically in the criminal justice process so that information can move from place to place almost instantly, providing information to decision-makers in a timely manner, reducing error, and eliminating the cost of human involvement.

The problem is that moving information gathered in one format for a specific purpose to another organization that must use it for a different purpose and in a different format is extremely difficult. Computers impose a much higher level of detail and a more rigid structure on business processes. Humans can interpret differences in format and transform data with little effort; these tasks are nearly impossible for computers to perform reliably. Computers struggle to resolve ambiguity through context; only when a programmer can anticipate every possible combination and permutation of outcomes, can reliable automated data exchange occur.

The simple solution is to develop standard methods of representing information and agreed-upon processes for exchange, which can nearly eliminate ambiguity. Once these standards are defined, the process of creating the connections and computer programs to pass and receive data is straightforward.

### *Principles of Integration*

A number of key principles are important if a common understanding of integration is to be shared throughout the criminal justice enterprise.

- Data acquisition is expensive and error prone—redundant data entry should be minimized or eliminated. This can create burdens at the front end of the process, as agencies must do more work to ensure that the information they capture also meets the needs of downstream users.
- Integration should be driven by existing operational systems, not by separate systems created solely to support integration. This will minimize labor requirements, cost, and error rates.
- No state has solved all of the problems and is doing integration perfectly — data exchange must be automated incrementally, but with an overall plan to ensure that short-term activities are taking the criminal justice enterprise in the proper direction.
- Integration is a strategic issue — it will require multiple budget cycles to complete, and its effects will span many organizations at every level of government.
- Integration involves cooperation between organizations with sometimes



conflicting or competing objectives. This makes commitment and leadership essential.

- Integration is like a marriage — it takes all partners working together to achieve success, and only one organization refusing to cooperate to make it fail.
- The criminal justice system cannot operate effectively with paper. Decision-makers must have all the information about individuals and events — identification, legal status, pending cases, and history — to make correct choices.

### *Benefits of Integration*

It should be clear at this point that integration is not easy to accomplish; many projects have failed because these principles have not been followed. The benefits of integration are so great that it is worth all of the effort. Benefits of integration include:

- Improved information quality
- Better decisions because of more and better information
- Elimination of error-prone and redundant data entry
- Timely access to information when it is needed most
- Elimination of barriers of time and space — 24 x 7 access from any location
- Improved public access to appropriate data
- New functions that can be performed by systems, such as automatic notification of appropriate officials if the status of an offender changes
- Greater efficiency in business processes
- Enhanced public safety
- Increased public trust and confidence in the justice system

### *Integration Makes the Justice System More Effective*

From a constitutional, political, budgetary, and organizational perspective, justice organizations are completely independent entities. From an operational perspective, they are just the opposite. They are functionally intertwined and completely interdependent with respect to doing their work. The justice system cannot work without a continuous flow of information between these organizations. Yet, planning, management, business process design, and automation occur almost totally internally, in isolated silos. Often the work that is

done to improve the internal operations of an agency with technology actually hinders the overall effectiveness of the justice enterprise. Integration provides a framework of collaboration that can help internal improvements produce external benefits.

## IV. Observations and Analysis

---

The state of Idaho is well behind most other states in addressing integration, but is in a better position than most to move forward rapidly. Time is of the essence, though; as each justice organization moves forward with technology on its own, the cost and difficulty of integration increase.

The following are some conclusions that relate to the current state of technology use in Idaho.

### **1. The current organizational structure of the justice enterprise is favorable for integration.**

Most state-level justice functions in Idaho are centralized and relatively compact, compared to other states. For example, some states divide public safety functions between four or five departments. Idaho's approach is more efficient than many in this respect and should pose no major barriers to integration.

The most significant organizational issue is the system of elected local prosecutors. While this structure does not prevent successful integration, it creates challenges in helping county attorneys see their role and responsibilities in the broader justice community. Locally elected prosecutors have been the champions of integration in a few states.

The court system, though somewhat decentralized organizationally, has created processes and automation that will deliver information as if it were a unified, centralized organization. County-based juvenile probation and detention functions could be a minor problem, but the Department of Juvenile Corrections has made inroads in collecting information from these agencies electronically.

### **2. The current political environment is both positive and negative with respect to supporting the integration of systems.**

The key issue at the political level is funding. Integration will cost money, more than can be provided by grants. These are funds that would be necessary to support automation anyway; integration merely assures that applications that are implemented are interoperable. In the long run, the state must adopt the integration initiative and support it. Grant funding can be very effective during the planning process.

Policy leaders in Idaho's justice system have a low recognition of integration and why it is critically important, but they support the principles of integration strongly. Most also demonstrate a limited understanding of what is being done with technology in other organizations in the justice community, a clear signal that more communication, cooperation, and collaboration are needed. Integration can be an effective vehicle in bringing justice organizations together to make the system operate more effectively and efficiently.

### **3. Technological capabilities in the justice community are adequate to begin integration planning.**

Overall, justice organizations in Idaho appear to be using technology effectively. There are, of course, some serious problems, but no more than in other states similarly situated. With respect to infrastructure, the network connectivity is not, at present, adequate to support high volume electronic information exchange. But as current plans materialize into IDANET, the state will be well positioned for rapid progress.

As in any state, the applications used in the justice enterprise are at various levels of effectiveness. Some must be created, some must be replaced, and some must be improved. As these decisions are made in the light of an integration strategic plan, each step moves the justice enterprise toward more effective performance.

There are relatively few automated interfaces between applications in place today. Many that are in place do not perform as well as they should. This can be as much of an opportunity as it is a problem. With integration planning, new and improved interfaces can be developed that consider other users of the information and other data exchanges between the organizations, contributing to a more effective system. This will deliver more bang for the buck to the citizens of Idaho.

## V. Recommendations

---

Based on the materials reviewed, on-site observations, and interviews of key justice system staff, the following recommendations are offered to the State of Idaho.

### **1. The state of Idaho should create a governance structure to guide integration efforts.**

Successful integration projects require the cooperation and collaboration of all three branches at every level of government. The executive, legislative, and judicial branches all have key roles to play to facilitate integration. Involvement of city and county officials is essential, since most information collection in an integrated environment occurs at the local level. This kind of close working relationship between justice organizations usually represents a radical departure from traditional ways of doing business. As with any kind of change, individual and organizational leadership must be strong to ensure success.

Perhaps the most important success factor in an integration initiative is the support of criminal justice policy leaders. There should be no question to anyone in any of the participating organizations about the seriousness of the commitment to integration. This dedication should be formal, documented, and well communicated throughout the enterprise. And it should be institutionalized organizationally.

#### ***Policy-level Governance***

States undertaking integration face a multifaceted array of political, organizational, legal, technical, cultural, and personal issues, including constitutional separation of powers and competing and conflicting objectives of participating organizations. Tough decisions must be made for the good of the initiative, even though they may be difficult for some organizations to accept. For this reason, a governance structure must be created that distributes responsibility, work, and decision-making fairly between criminal justice system components. Typically, this governance structure consists of the policy leaders of the major participating organizations.

This governing group has many functions and responsibilities, including:

- Providing leadership to the integration initiative;
- Developing a common understanding of problems, obstacles, and barriers;
- Instituting an enterprise approach to policy, planning, funding, architecture, and legislative changes;
- Creating a unified vision of the future and a plan for achieving it;

- Formalizing agreement on scope of effort by organization, transaction, etc.;
- Obtaining needed resources;
- Resolving legal, technical, and operational problems that cannot be handled at a lower level;
- Committing internal agency resources;
- Keeping the project on schedule;
- Monitoring progress; and
- Identifying and resolving problems quickly.

Creation of this body also will generate enthusiasm for the integration initiative, focus energy, and ensure accountability.

The policy-level governing body for integration in Idaho should be comprised of policy-level state officials from all of the key stakeholder organizations. With respect to local governments, geographic and discipline-specific representatives also should be part of the governing body.<sup>3</sup> The following is a list of organizations that should be considered for inclusion in the integration policy group.

- Legislative branch representatives (2, possibly a senator and a representative involved in their respective judiciary committees);
- Judicial branch representatives (2, possibly the chief justice or her designee and a judge or administrator from a trial court);
- State Police;
- ILETS Board member;
- Department of Correction;
- Department of Juvenile Corrections;
- Department of Transportation;
- Information Technology Resources Management Council;

---

<sup>3</sup> For more information on governance of integrated structures, download the SEARCH publication *Integrated Justice Information Systems: Governance Structures, Roles and Responsibilities* at <http://www.search.org/images/pdf/Governance.pdf>. Also, see Appendix D: Integration Planning Materials from Other Jurisdictions.

- Attorney General (perhaps representing homeland security issues);
- Prosecuting Attorney's Association (2);
- Local Law Enforcement (2);
- Local detention facilities (2);
- District Court Administrators or Clerks (2);
- Federal agencies (2, possibly law enforcement and judicial);

This kind of governance structure helps secure and maintain executive support and organizational commitment for the integration initiative. This governing body should address policy issues and not get involved in operational and technical matters. Other states have found that policy leaders quickly lose interest if meetings deal with issues that are irrelevant to their level of activity. It is suggested that the entire group meet three to four times per year for the first year or two, until the strategic planning process is complete. Thereafter, less frequent meetings may be required.

The State of Idaho has three options for building an integration governance structure: 1) create a new group, 2) use the Information Technology Resource Management Council, or 3) expand the charter of the Criminal Justice Council. The option that is selected is not as important as ensuring that all of the stakeholders are represented appropriately. The advantage of using an existing group is that the cost and overhead of creating a new organization is avoided; the disadvantage is that existing organizations either do not include key stakeholders of the justice system, or they include others with little direct interest in justice system integration.

### ***Other Committees***

Because so many organizations must be represented, a smaller executive committee of the policy group also should be formed to handle day-to-day issues. An executive committee, with one representative each for law enforcement, prosecution, courts, and corrections, should meet as often as necessary between meetings of the entire group.

Other work groups and subcommittees should be created by the policy-level committee, as needed, to deal with legal, technical, and operational issues, but it is essential that high-level sponsorship of the integration initiative continue throughout the long and difficult journey. It is important that these subcommittees also be representative of the organizations that have a stake in the issues they are created to address. Some of the responsibilities of these other groups could include:

- Providing information on legacy applications and current procedures;

- Analyzing and recommending specific information exchanges to automate;
- Identifying and articulating technical and operational issues;
- Analyzing and improving business processes;
- Analyzing and recommending technical solutions;
- Resolving information policy issues;
- Recommending, negotiating, and maintaining standards; and
- Determining resource needs.

Most of the work of the integration initiative will be completed by operational and technical committees and subcommittees that should be similarly representative of the stakeholder organizations. A committee with legal expertise could handle information policy issues, such as privacy, confidentiality, public access, etc., while analysis of existing infrastructure and applications could be delegated to a group of technicians. Similarly, business process issues could be assigned to a committee of operational experts from the various organizations. The policy level group only manages, reviews, and adopts the work of these groups.

### ***Charter***

A prerequisite to the creation of the policy group is the creation of a charter. Three approaches to charting an integration initiative have been used in other states. They include 1) statutory authorization, 2) executive or executive/judicial order, and 3) memorandum of understanding. Any of the three can provide adequate delineation of the composition and responsibilities of organizations and individuals. The statutory approach is preferred because it institutionalizes integration and ensures that it will survive as individuals in key positions change. If a statutory approach is selected, the language must be broad and general—defining the composition of the group, its responsibilities, authority to create committees and subcommittees, and a schedule for a few key events, such as the creation of a strategic plan by a date certain.<sup>4</sup> If an order or memorandum of understanding is used to charter the initiative, it should address the same issues. It can be more detailed, since modifications of scope or resource allocation can be addressed more easily.

### ***Staffing***

At some point in the future, a dedicated staff for the integration initiative will be required, beginning with an integration coordinator. The size and type of staff

---

<sup>4</sup> SEARCH maintains a web site of integration projects throughout the United States, including copies of chartering language used by each. It can be found at [http://www.search.org/integration/state\\_map.asp](http://www.search.org/integration/state_map.asp). Also, see Appendix D: Integration Planning Materials from Other Jurisdictions for samples.



needed will depend heavily on the architectural model chosen. Integration staff may support networks, develop applications, or simply coordinate activities.

During the initial planning stages, participating agencies can contribute staff time until grant funding or state appropriations to support the effort can be obtained. A new round of funding through the Crime Identification and Technology Act (CITA) should be available through the National Governor's Association shortly.

Experience has shown that when the staff of an integration initiative is placed within a single agency or branch of government, other key stakeholders are far less willing to participate in the shared sacrifices that are necessary for success. The integration staff may be viewed as favoring the agenda of that agency over all others. For this reason, it is recommended that staff report directly to the policy group, rather than to any individual organization.

## **2. Under the direction of the policy group, the state of Idaho should prepare a high-level strategic plan to guide integration efforts.**

Strategic planning is the first step to be performed after the governing body has been established. The strategic planning process produces an agenda for the future that is shared by the entire justice enterprise. It can be used to ensure that all short-term and internal activities are moving the justice system closer to its long-term goals, and to make certain that resources are focused on the most pressing justice system needs. The plan also creates accountability with funding bodies and the public.

Strategic plans for integration are not the same as internal IT strategic plans. The integration plan is a high-level framework for inter-organizational activity that must mesh with individual agency business plans. The output is a list of priority projects that require more detailed planning and project management. Integration plans are more concerned with operational requirements of system interfaces than with functional requirements of applications. The integration plan also focuses more on architecture, infrastructure, and interfaces than on applications. Much of the work related to application acquisition, development, and enhancement will remain within the justice organizations that use them.

The essence of strategic planning is found in three questions:

- Where are we?
- Where do we want to go?
- How do we get there?

Appendix C: SEARCH Integration Strategic Planning Template contains a suggested format for the strategic plan, along with sample content based on work done in other states. The template is organized around an assessment of the current state of technology, development of a vision of the desired future for the

justice enterprise, and a series of steps to move in that direction. It is recommended that the State of Idaho use this strategic planning template, modifying it as necessary. The template consists of the following sections:

1. Introduction
2. Integration Definition: Establishing a Common Understanding
3. Governance Structure
4. Charter
5. Mission
6. Vision
7. Values
8. Strategic Issues
9. Goals
10. Operational Requirements
11. Plan for Stage II Planning Activities
12. Integration Needs and Readiness Assessment
13. Review of Current Technology Environment
14. Analysis of Information Exchange
15. Standards Development
16. Information Policy
17. Integration Architecture
18. Communication Planning
19. Prioritized Project List
20. Strategic Plan Implementation
21. Strategic Management of Integration

### ***Strategic Planning Process***

Strategic planning should occur in three stages; the first establishes a common understanding and vision for the initiative, followed by a period of analysis and

design, then preparation of the final strategic plan, which includes a prioritized list of projects for implementation.

### *Stage I Planning*

The initial meeting of the policy group and key staff that will be involved in the integration initiative should focus on education. An important step in gaining the commitment of policy leaders of justice organizations is to have a common understanding of what integration is and what the justice community desires to accomplish. SEARCH staff can assist with this initial session, or the state can contact leaders of successful integration efforts from other parts of the country. Information contained in this report can be adapted for presentation by local leaders, as well.

The second objective of the initial meeting should be to review the proposed planning process, modifying it as needed. The integration policy should formally adopt the planning process to solidify commitment.

A third objective of the initial meeting of the policy group is to begin the process of developing a common definition, mission, vision, values, strategic issues, goals, and operational requirements statements for the integration effort. This will create a shared vision, commitment, and ownership for the initiative. Samples of some of these materials that have been developed in other areas are included in Appendix D: Integration Planning Materials from Other Jurisdictions.

The initial meeting of the policy group should conclude with assignments to various groups and individuals to prepare the first ten sections of the strategic plan, reviewing appropriate materials from other states and drafting language that fits the local justice environment. A subsequent meeting or meetings can be used to refine these statements and prepare them for publication in the strategic plan.

Another important task for the policy group during the first stage of planning is to organize operational, technical, legal, and policy groups to conduct second-stage planning activities. The SEARCH Integration Strategic Planning Template suggests seven areas of study (sections 12 through 18 of the template), but the policy group may choose to modify this list as appropriate for the jurisdiction. Group members should agree on a plan for completing all of these activities. It should be noted that work in some of these areas cannot begin until others are nearing completion, so good planning is essential. This plan will be placed in section eleven of the template.

The final task in the first stage of planning is to publish the preliminary strategic plan, consisting of the first eleven sections of the template, as modified locally. It should be published electronically on an integrated justice web site, and distributed on paper to justice organizations throughout the jurisdiction.

### *Stage II Planning*

A number of planning tasks will require more focused attention by justice system

specialists. These tasks vary from state to state, though many are common throughout the country. Stage II planning consists of work by practitioners to address issues identified by the integration policy group. SEARCH recommends that the policy group consider the following:

- assess how well the state is doing with information sharing and determine how ready the state is for an integration initiative;
- review existing technology infrastructure, applications, and interfaces throughout the justice enterprise;
- analyze current business processes and information flow, to determine specific interfaces that must be developed between applications<sup>5</sup>;
- develop data standards that define a common format for information when it crosses organizational boundaries;
- create technical standards for connection to the integrated system;
- craft information policy to address confidentiality, privacy, public access, dissemination, security, quality, and ownership;
- design an integration architecture for the state;<sup>6</sup>
- formulate an education and communication plan to gain universal support and commitment in the justice community for the integration venture; and
- establish a prioritized list of projects necessary to implement the integration initiative.

The following chart shows how these tasks relate to one another:

---

<sup>5</sup> SEARCH provides the Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM) at no charge to state and local jurisdictions to support this analysis. Information on JIEM is included in Appendix E.

<sup>6</sup> See Appendix F for a listing of integration models that may be helpful in developing an architecture for the state.

Integration Stage II Strategic Planning Activities						
Month:	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Needs and Readiness Assessment					
	Review of Current Technology					
	Information Exchange Analysis					
			Standards Development			
			Information Policy			
			Integration Architecture			
					Prioritized Project List	

**Chart 1 — Stage II Planning**

The policy group should meet periodically during second stage planning to monitor progress and to address problems that may arise. The state of Idaho should plan to complete this work in approximately six to eight months.

### *Stage III Planning*

Once all of the analysis and design work of the second stage is complete, the policy group should meet to finish the final version of the strategic plan. The results of each of those efforts should be documented for publication. The final section of the plan should be a list of projects and priorities for future action. Some of these projects will be addressed by local governments, some by the state. Some can be addressed by existing staff or funded through grants; other will require state, county, or city appropriations. The role of the policy group will then be to monitor the completion of projects on the list, making necessary adjustments along the way, and lobbying for needed resources.

### *Strategic Plan Revisions*

The integration policy group should continue to manage the integration initiative as projects on the list are addressed. At some point it will be necessary to update and revise the strategic plan, perhaps at two- or three-year intervals, to show progress and to update priorities. A similar process can be used to update the plan as was used to create it.

### *Implementing the Plan*

Integration planning must be an ongoing visionary process integrated with internal IT and business planning processes of each of the stakeholder organizations. Over the course of several years, as internal and enterprise directions begin to merge, momentum for integration will be established. The role of the policy group then transforms from building support for the initiative to providing oversight to dozens of projects all over the state.

The integration policy group can work with stakeholder organizations to create action plans for the top few priorities on the list. Periodic review of these projects can keep enthusiasm high as progress is realized. Of course, the availability of resources may dictate that projects are not addressed in the exact order established

by the policy group.

The plan should be clear that additional planning and project management will be necessary for each of these projects—the policy group will only monitor and manage at a high level. It will be up to the organizations involved in the effort to do the rest.

### **3. The state of Idaho should conduct an integration needs assessment and a readiness assessment.**

The main premise of an integration project is that justice system officials do not have complete, accurate, and timely information to make decisions. While most justice officials have a sense of the inadequacy of available information, few have attempted to measure the magnitude of the problem. Most integration initiatives have been driven by anecdotal information, rather than by sound measures of need.

In a similar vein, few jurisdictions have conducted a systematic assessment of the readiness of the justice enterprise for integration, beyond studying the level of technology in use. How committed are justice system officials to improving the quality of their decisions? How capable are staff in justice organizations of making significant changes in business processes? How available are resources to address critical needs? Because integration efforts are major commitments, it is important to establish a basis for the decision to proceed.

The public tends to believe that justice system officials know the identity of suspects and defendants that they process, that they have a complete history of their prior arrests and prosecutions from any state, not just for felonies, but for misdemeanors, infractions, traffic, juvenile offenses, etc., and that they know about all pending cases and any terms of supervisions or orders that may apply. In fact, decision-makers generally see only the tip of the iceberg. But finding out how much we do not know is not an easy task.

We recommend that the state of Idaho conduct a thorough evaluation of need and readiness for integration, adapting questions contained found in Appendix G: Integration Needs Assessment and Integration Readiness Assessment.

### **4. The state of Idaho should conduct an assessment of existing technology in the justice environment.**

As a part of stage II planning, the state should undertake a study of existing technology infrastructure, applications, and interfaces between systems throughout the state. This assessment can be conducted with a questionnaire that should cover all of the areas of interest of an integrated system. The questionnaire should be distributed to all justice agencies in the state, as well as any non-justice organizations with which the justice system exchanges significant amounts of information, though 100 percent return from local agencies will not be required.

This assessment should be simple and should focus on areas that will affect integration. It is not necessary to count the number and age of every personal computer in the state, for example. The information should provide a general picture of how ready each organization is to participate in an integration effort. A maximum of a few weeks should be allowed for the assessment to be conducted.

### ***Infrastructure***

With respect to infrastructure, the most important elements are communications bandwidth and available protocols, which will be essential to establishing linkages through which information can flow. The internal computing environment also may be of interest, particularly if justice organizations are saddled with antiquated hardware and software.

### ***Applications***

Justice-related software applications also should be cataloged as a part of the assessment. The focus should be on systems that contain case and offender information, not administrative systems, such as budget and finance, personnel, jury management, etc. It is helpful to know the age of the system, the operating environment, who developed and maintains the system, etc.

### ***Interfaces***

The state of Idaho already passes information electronically between some justice-related information systems. It is important to capture detailed information about these interfaces during the assessment process, including the formats and validation criteria of information, and business rules governing these exchanges. If the interfaces have been documented, a complete copy should be obtained. This data will feed into the information exchange analysis.

Information that is collected about infrastructure, applications, and interfaces will form a baseline for measuring the gaps between the existing technology environment and the desired technology environment. It is impossible to chart a course to improve the use of technology in the Idaho justice enterprise without a complete and detailed description of what is currently in place.

## **5. The state of Idaho should conduct a thorough analysis of information exchange between local, state, and federal justice organizations.**

A thorough analysis of information exchange between justice organizations is essential to the success of an integration initiative. By simply bringing agency staff together to review information processing, many states have been able to make dramatic improvements. Although most employees have a general understanding of how information is passed between organizations, very few grasp details outside of their domain.

SEARCH has been working for some time on the Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM) project. Staff has collected data from more than 20 state and local

criminal justice systems, and is conducting an analysis of that information to understand similarities and differences. The global model of data exchange that is emerging from this project will assist states their internal evaluation efforts and save considerable work in integrating systems.

The JIEM project describes data sharing in terms of the agencies participating in the exchange, the event and process that trigger the exchange, the actual information that is passed, and the conditions that may cause variations in the process. For example, a felony arrest and a misdemeanor arrest may trigger the creation of different forms that may be sent to different organizations.

As a part of this project, SEARCH has created an information-modeling tool that can facilitate the analysis of data exchange in the states. It is Web-based software provided at no charge, and agencies can contribute information from remote locations without special software or hardware. The tool is available for immediate use.<sup>7</sup>

Already it has been determined that there about 60 justice system events that trigger the exchange of information between organizations. The nature of these exchanges varies from state to state, primarily because of organizational differences. As JIEM project staff has controlled for these organizational differences, exchanges in different states are remarkably similar.

The state of Idaho must identify and analyze each information exchange between justice and justice-related agencies. This will require the participation of operational experts from each justice discipline, meeting weekly for several hours over a two to three month time period. Once all of the exchanges have been documented, the integration policy group can evaluate the results, selecting the specific exchanges that are most important to automate, based on urgency, importance, frequency, and other factors.

Clearly it will not be possible to involve every local agency in this information exchange analysis. Many states have selected a few counties to participate in this exercise as pilots, then allowing other jurisdictions to review the results to see if anything has been missed. Most states also have limited the scope of their initial efforts based on case type, age of offenders, etc. Typically, the first attempt to document information exchange involves adult felony and serious misdemeanor case types, though other options can be chosen.

The JIEM Modeling Tool can play another role in the state's integration initiative. Just as it is used to document current information flow and business practices, it also can be used to define the new environment, incorporating improved

---

<sup>7</sup> To learn more about the Justice Information Exchange Model, please visit the SEARCH web site at [http://www.search.org/integration/info\\_exchange.asp](http://www.search.org/integration/info_exchange.asp). Also, see the materials in Appendix E: The Justice Information Exchange Model.



processes and electronic equivalents of paper processing. Used in this way, it can contribute to the development of integration architecture.

## **6. The state of Idaho should develop standards for the exchange of information between justice system organizations.**

It would be preferable for all justice organizations share a common data structure and format, but transition to such a scheme, were it possible, could take more than a decade to complete. A more realistic solution is to define standards for the interchange of information. Agencies can do whatever they want with their data internally, so long as they can put it in a common format before transmission.<sup>8</sup> The standards are published and distributed throughout the justice enterprise, and a maintenance mechanism allows for adjustments as the needs of organizations and the capabilities of technology change. Integration then becomes a much simpler exercise of moving standard information from place to place, rather than a more complex process of mapping and translating data as it moves through the system.

Fortunately, internal data structures tend to be much more complex than is required outside an organization, so standard structures for integration can be simpler than they are within justice applications. Some information lends itself to standardization throughout the justice system; NCIC standards for personal descriptors, for example, can be used in any justice-related organization.

Perhaps the biggest challenge facing justice agencies in most states is in developing a standard referencing method for offense codes. Most organizations rely on the statutory reference for offense codes, but because there is not a one-to-one relationship between statutes and chargeable offenses, most append something to the end to make each code unique. The problem is that every agency in a state may this differently, which creates barriers to the smooth flow of information in an integrated system. In addition, local ordinance violations often have unique numbering systems for each city and county.

Many states have created committees to develop standard offense codes that can be used by all justice organizations. These groups also can address other data standards, as well. State legislatures can assist by ensuring that new laws and amendments to existing laws have clear and unambiguous code references. One state is even in the process of re-codifying its criminal code so there is no confusion about how offenses are to be charged. A number of creative approaches also have been developed to deal with local ordinances.

We recommend that the state of Idaho create a data standards committee as a part of its stage II planning activities. This group should function under the direction

---

<sup>8</sup> Some integration models place this data translation at a central point in the network so individual agencies are not required to perform the task.

of the integration policy group and should begin its work as soon as the results of the information exchange analysis are available. While it will complete the majority of its work within two or three months, the data standards committee will have ongoing responsibilities for many years to come.

There are a number of standards development activities currently underway at the national level.<sup>9</sup> Those tasked with developing standards in Idaho should be cognizant of these efforts and follow the progress of these groups, as they may save the state considerable time, money, and effort.

Data standards are an important part of all integration projects. Other technical standards also will be required, but work in these areas probably should wait until the adoption of the integration architecture by the policy group.

## **7. The state of Idaho should review legal and policy issues surrounding the electronic exchange of information.**

Another important issue that must be addressed during stage II planning activities is information policy. The cultures of justice organizations vary considerably in this regard, and some of the most significant disagreements in integration projects will be in this area. Some organizations traditionally protect information resources to preserve the integrity of the investigative and deliberative processes. Others view justice system activities as open and public, and do their best to make information available.

In reality, both approaches are correct and must be respected. The nature of information access and distribution changes during the life of a case. During an investigation, confidentiality is extremely important to avoid jeopardizing a prosecution and to protect the privacy rights of suspects who are not guilty, as well as victims and witnesses. Court proceedings generally are required by the constitution to be open, and records of those proceedings also are considered public. Information that would not be released during an investigation, now may be disseminated widely. Similarly, access to that same data may be limited following the proceedings, particularly if expungement or sealing orders are issued. Many states limit by state law the distribution of arrest and conviction information held in state repositories.

Implementation of an integrated system will raise all kinds of questions that have not been addressed before, so it is important to be prepared. Agencies may not be willing to share information they consider to be confidential with another organization that may release it to the public. These kinds of situations can create friction and confusion, often causing coalitions to crumble.

---

<sup>9</sup> For further information on standards efforts in progress, see [http://www.search.org/integration/about\\_integration.asp](http://www.search.org/integration/about_integration.asp), <http://www.it.ojp.gov/index.jsp>, <http://www.ncsc.dni.us/ncsc/ctp/htdocs/standards.htm>, and <http://www.search.org/xml/default.asp>.

The following is a list of information policy issues that may arise:

- Privacy
- Confidentiality
- Data ownership
- Security
- Public access
- Data dissemination
- Data quality

We recommend that the state of Idaho establish an information policy committee to manage these issues during the integration process. Each justice discipline should be represented in the group, and law-trained individuals should be appointed when possible. Whenever an information policy issue arises in any other committee or in the integration policy group, it should be referred to this committee. It should be charged with researching existing policy, laws, and regulations that are relevant to the issues being raised. Often existing law does not resolve the issue, but defines a range of legally permissible options. In these circumstances, the information policy committee should outline the options and draft a recommended policy for consideration by the integration policy group.

## **8. The state of Idaho should develop an architecture for integration of the justice enterprise.**

Architecture is a blueprint for construction of the integrated system. It includes infrastructure (the development, processing, data, and communications environment in which applications run), applications (software packages that assist justice agencies in doing their work), and interfaces (connections between systems that allow access to information or the movement of data from one application to another). A sound architecture is the foundation of a successful integrated system.

There are a wide variety of approaches that have been used in various integration initiatives around the country. Appendix F: Integration Models contains a more detailed discussion of these methodologies. Here is a brief summary of those models:

- **Anarchy model:**
  - No central planning
  - No coordination in connecting systems

- Custom interfaces
- No thought to other existing or needed interfaces
- No thought to other organizations with similar needs
- **Network model:**
  - Earliest form of integration
  - Ability to inquire into other systems
  - No data exchange
  - Efforts to standardize infrastructure
    - Computing platform
    - Telecommunications systems
    - Applications development environment
- **Centralized model:**
  - Single application supporting most justice organizations
  - Shared core data or programs supporting multiple applications
  - First true integrated systems
- **Umbrella model:**
  - Master index connecting separate systems used in different justice organizations
  - Provides multi-system response from a single inquiry
  - Contains pointers to data
- **Warehouse model:**
  - Inexpensive solution when dealing with obsolete systems
  - Provides excellent communication in diverse environments
  - Information is not current
  - Data exchange remains an issue

- **Middleware model:**
  - New system as the hub of the justice network
  - Translates codes as data are passed from one system to another
- **Statewide model:**
  - Integrate state-level applications first
  - Add local agencies as they are ready
- **Standardized interface model:**
  - Develop data and technical specifications for system interfaces
  - Publish and maintain standards centrally
  - Each organization can develop applications that meet its needs, so long as they conform to the standards
- **Portal model:**
  - A single, secure, web-based access point for all enterprise information and applications
  - Access to structured, unstructured, and event data
  - A person-based interface to integrated information

Many factors determine which model, or which combination of models, a jurisdiction will choose. Existing technology and integration should be considered, including the maturity, functionality, and environment of the systems. The size and complexity of the network will dictate certain approaches, in conjunction with the geography and population distribution of the state. Volume of information flow also is a factor, along with the cost of the various approaches.

We recommend that, at the conclusion of the study phase of planning, the state of Idaho assemble its best technologists from stakeholder organizations and prepare a recommended integration architecture for the justice enterprise.

## **9. The state of Idaho should create a plan to conduct an aggressive communication and educational initiative to build support for integration at all levels of the justice system.**

The integration effort must have the support of the policy leaders of justice and justice-related organizations at all levels of government if it is to succeed. In addition, it must have broader political and public support. This does not occur

just because integration is a good idea and the right thing to do. It requires a coordinated, well-planned effort by justice leadership throughout the state.

The results of the integration needs assessment should provide the information needed to make a business case for integration. The preliminary strategic plan should provide the vision and the direction. What is needed is a way to communicate this information to everyone who should hear it. This is the purpose of the communication and education plan.

A number of materials can be prepared very early in the integration initiative to help build support for the initiative. The following list is based on ideas developed in other states:

- Integration web site
- Electronic integration newsletter<sup>10</sup>
- Annual state and regional educational conferences
- Sessions in the state's E-government Boot Camp
- Media coverage
- Pamphlets or brochures
- Participation in national integration workshops and symposia

We recommend that the state of Idaho create a communication and education committee to prepare materials and to develop a dissemination plan, to help increase support of the integration effort beyond those directly involved.

#### **10. Following the completion of second-stage planning activities, the state of Idaho should prepare a list of integration projects and priorities.**

The final stage II planning activity is to synthesize the results of the other work into a prioritized project list. The first step in this process is to create a list of possible projects. This list should include any infrastructure upgrades that are needed to support the architecture that was designed. If key organizations lack suitable automation, then the acquisition, development, or enhancement of applications is a necessary precursor to integration.

Once automation and infrastructure issues are addressed, it is then time to determine which information exchanges are of highest priority. This may be based on the volume of information that is shared, the cost savings associated with the elimination of redundant data entry, or the improvements in justice

---

<sup>10</sup> See the sample newsletter from the Maricopa County integration project in Appendix H.

system decisions that can result. The highest-priority interfaces should be added to the project list.

It is often practical to test integration in a small number of locations before deploying it statewide. For example, a prosecutor web-based disposition reporting system could be pilot tested in several counties before being rolled out statewide. This provides an opportunity to correct problems and refine procedures before a large number of users are involved. It helps if pilot tests are performed in a variety of locations, e.g., a large, medium, and small county.

The integration policy group then reviews the list that has been created and develops priorities. This list is published in the strategic plan and becomes the foundation for integration activities for the next several years. The focus of attention of policy leaders then is to accomplish as many of the projects as possible. The initial planning process for integration is then complete.

## VI. Conclusion

---

Idaho is behind most other states in integrating its justice information systems. While some interfaces have been developed, the lack of a guiding methodology has resulted in varying approaches. The cost and complexity of these customized interfaces developed in isolation will be fully realized as future progress inevitably stalls.

Barriers to successful integration are organizational, political, and technological. Only by working together can the justice system marshal the support needed to make fundamental changes.

The most essential key to success with integration is to have the right people at the table — leaders of justice organizations — working together and directing the activity of specialized groups assembled to lay the foundation for an enterprise approach to doing business.

The strategic planning process will unite the justice community in the pursuit of a common vision and goals. It will provide a forum for effective communication, cooperation, and collaboration. Together, justice organizations will accomplish much more than they can accomplish individually.



**Appendix A:  
About SEARCH,  
the Integration Technical  
Assistance Program,  
and the Project Team**

## **BJA TA Stuff**

*(Description of grant program to be inserted during editing process.)*

## **Project Staff**

**Lawrence P. Webster** is a Justice Information Systems Specialist with SEARCH. He previously served as Delaware's State Court Administrator; Executive Director of Court Technology Programs at the National Center for State Courts; Director of Data Processing for the Utah courts; System Manager for the U.S. Attorney, District of Colorado; and Manager of Operations and Systems Development for the Colorado District Attorneys' Council. He has delivered numerous seminars, presentations, and courses and has headed or participated in research, education, and consulting projects related to technology in the justice system. He was the principal author of *A Guidebook for Electronic Court Filing* and *Automating Court Systems*, and has prepared or assisted with many other books, articles, and papers on similar topics. He holds a Master of Science in Judicial Administration degree from the University of Denver College of Law, is a fellow of the Institute for Court Management (ICM), and is a graduate of ICM's Court Technology Certificate Program.

**Appendix B:  
Technical Assistance  
Project Participants and  
Documents Reviewed**

## Technical Assistance Project Participants

Brad Alvaro, Information Services Manager, Department of Correction

Chris Atwood, Automated Systems Manager, Department of Transportation

Hon. Harold R. Bunderson, Idaho State Senate

Rich Elwood, ITRMC Coordinator, Department of Administration

John Hofland, IT Applications Manager, Department of Correction

Michael Key, IT Information Services Manager, Idaho State Police

Sandee Meyer, Executive Coordinator, Idaho Prosecuting Attorney's Association

John Peay, Information Systems Director, Idaho Supreme Court

Ed Pemble, Driver Services Manager, Department of Transportation

Donald B. Peterson, ILETS Field Training Supervisor, Idaho State Police

Brent Reinke, Director, Department of Juvenile Corrections

Mark Richardson, IT Bureau Chief, Department of Transportation

Kathy Ruffalo, Senior Policy Advisor, Governor's Office

Mike Seifrit, IT Manager, Department of Juvenile Corrections

Roberta Silva, Bureau Chief, Planning, Grants, and Research, Idaho State Police

Robert E. Taylor, Manager, Bureau of Criminal Identification, Idaho State Police

Patricia Tobias, Administrative Director, Idaho Supreme Court

## **Documents Reviewed**

Idaho State Police Bureau of Criminal Identification Brochure.

Improvements in Data Management Needed at the Commission of Pardons and Parole: Collaboration with the Department of Correction Could Significantly Advance Efforts. Office of Performance Evaluations, Idaho State Legislature, May 2001.

State of Idaho Criminal History Records 2002 Improvement Plan.

Idaho Code Title 67 Chapter 30, Criminal History Records and Crime Information.

State of Idaho Judicial Branch—Idaho Statewide Trial Court Information System (ISTARS)

2002 NCHIP Application.

Idaho State Police web site: <http://www.isp.state.id.us/identification/>

Idaho Information Technology Resource Management Council web site: <http://www2.state.id.us/itrmc/index.htm>

**Appendix C:  
SEARCH Integration  
Strategic Planning Template**

## **SEARCH Integration Strategic Planning Template**

This template offers a suggested format for planning the implementation of a state- or county-based integration initiative. The first eleven sections of this template should be completed in the first stage of the planning process. The eleventh section is a plan for completing second stage planning activities. When the first planning stage is complete, the preliminary strategic plan should be published.

Sections 12 through 19 of the template document second stage planning activities and should be added to the plan during the third stage, along with the remaining sections of the template, 20 and 21. The final version of the strategic plan then should be published and distributed throughout the justice community.

### **1. Introduction**

The strategic plan for integration should contain a brief introduction that summarizes the purpose of the plan and its scope. A cover letter, signed by members of the policy group, also can be added, along with an executive summary, if desired. The strategic planning process should be described, including how the plan will be maintained and updated in the future. Participants in the planning process should be listed, including all subcommittees. A site also may choose to provide some historical background on how the integration initiative began. Finally, the introduction should provide an overview of how the document is organized.

### **2. Integration Definition: Establishing a Common Understanding**

The strategic plan should include a definition of integration upon which all members of the policy group can agree. The definition should be general enough that it will not restrict future activities, but not so vague that it is not helpful in educating readers. Elements that can be considered in crafting a definition of integration that fits the local environment are listed below.

- Integration is the ability to access and share critical information electronically at key decision points throughout the justice enterprise.
- Integration is the automation of information exchange between justice and justice-related organizations.
- Integration is providing complete, accurate, and timely information to justice system decision-makers, when and where it is needed.
- Integration is standardizing information flow in the justice enterprise, along with the business rules that govern it.
- Integration is the linking of information systems in justice organizations.

The following excellent example of a definition of integration comes from the draft strategic plan from the Illinois Integrated Justice Information System.

Within the confines of the justice community, integration describes those processes that deliver information and intelligence to decision makers at all levels. Judgments are made everyday that affect the life, liberty, property and safety of our citizens. The quality of these decisions is a direct consequence of the quality and amount of information available at the time a decision is made.

Advances in information and identification technologies, and in the ability to share and deliver this information, are revolutionizing the way business is done in the justice community. As a result, our definition of integration is evolving and expanding as quickly as the changes in the technology that drive it. For example, not too long ago, system integration was considered mostly in the context of the justice / public safety community. Today, the lines between criminal and civil justice are fading. The old prohibitions on access to criminal history are being replaced with public access via the Internet to sex offender registries.

Who are today's decision makers? The cop in her cruiser checking the warrant file via a cellular connection from a laptop. A judge on the bench making a bail decision based on the criminal history information on his computer monitor. The prosecutor who is deciding whether a defendant should be treated as a first time or a habitual offender. A public defender showing his client an online report from the toxicology lab, describing its analysis of a substance seized during his arrest. A probation officer who receives notice that one of his probationers was arrested last night in a nearby state. A prison official about to release an inmate for completion of a sentence, unaware that this same inmate is wanted by a jurisdiction 1500 miles away. A court scheduling clerk who sets a case for trial, not knowing that one of the attorneys in the case is already booked for a murder trial in another court.

The focus of integrated justice, through the electronic exchange of information, is to increase the chances that in each of these instances, the best decision will be made. Some of the same information previously shared only among public safety agencies is today being used by civil courts which process juvenile cases, issue protective orders,



or go after assets when child support or restitution payments are not made. Gun dealers, drug treatment providers, social service agencies, daycare operators and school administrators use it.

The examples given here of information shared through integrated systems are no longer based in fantasy. They are in use today and describe the ultimate potential of shared information. However, the stark reality is that for most jurisdictions, critical decision-support information is not available, sometimes within the same organization, or between agencies within a jurisdiction, or between neighboring municipalities, counties, and states. And in those places where information is shared, the data being shared are frequently of poor quality.

The kinds of information that can be shared are changing, too. In a digital environment, fingerprints, photos, maps, investigative records, drug test results and satellite tracking of ankle bracelets-all can be conveyed across existing networks.

In a world where the same VISA card can be used in Paris, France or Paris, Tennessee, public patience is wearing thin with a justice community where critical public safety information is not immediately available from the next county. Aside from the more obvious public safety implications of disconnected information, another result is the waste of public resources that occurs when the best decision is not made, thousands of times every day. Police officers scheduled to testify on their day off, incurring overtime expense. A prisoner is not delivered on the day of trial wasting precious judicial, legal and courtroom resources. A juvenile who has failed out of three previous placements is assigned to a first offender's drug treatment program.

Making better decisions improves public safety and results in the efficient use of public resources. Having the right information at the right place and at the right time results in better decisions. Integration of information systems is what enables the delivery of that information.

A SEARCH publication provides a more extensive discussion that may be helpful

in developing a definition of integrated justice.<sup>11</sup> It is available from the SEARCH web site.

### 3. Governance Structure

This section of the strategic plan should describe (and perhaps show with a diagram) the governance structure established by the integration charter and how it relates to justice organizations. It should include all of the committees, subcommittees, or work groups created to complete planning tasks and to do the actual work of integration. A description of the process used by the governing body to manage the integration process – its operating rules – also could be added.

The following example is from the state of Missouri:

The governance of the statewide integration efforts is provided through the Missouri Criminal Records Advisory Committee. This Committee is established by Missouri statute and is chaired by the Director of the Department of Public Safety. The Committee is comprised of high-level officials from within the State and their appointment is either set out in statute or by the Director of the Department of Public Safety. The Committee meets annually and provides direction to agencies contributing to the Missouri Central Records Repository and acts upon policy recommendations that affect the operation of the Missouri criminal justice information system. The Advisory Committee has also named a sub-committee to administer grant funds distributed to Missouri that contribute to the improvement of criminal history records. The sub-committee is charged with developing grant applications and administering the resulting awards in a manner that is supportive of Missouri's integration efforts in the criminal justice environment. The sub-committee has responsibility for the National Criminal History Improvement Program, the Byrne 5% Set Aside Program and other grant programs that become available and will contribute to the improvement of the criminal justice information system and the State's integration efforts.

---

<sup>11</sup> *Integration in the Context of Justice Information Systems: a Common Understanding* at [http://www.search.org/integration/about\\_integration.asp#publications](http://www.search.org/integration/about_integration.asp#publications).

## 4. Charter

This section of the strategic plan should summarize the charter for the integration initiative. A copy of the actual statute, order, or memorandum also should be included in this section or attached to the strategic plan.

Integration charters typically cover a number of areas:

- Establishment of the integration policy group;
- Statement of the purpose of the group;
- Composition of the group and who makes appointments;
- Members, service, and qualifications;
- Leadership of the group;
- Staffing for the initiative;
- Duties and responsibilities of the policy group;
- Authority to establish committees;
- Authority to contract, hire staff, etc.; and
- Budget.

There are additional areas that are found in some of the charters (more often in orders or memoranda of understanding than in statutes) that, while they are useful in helping people understand what the integration initiative is all about, are not as essential as the previous list.

- Definitions;
- Reasons for establishing the policy group;
- Benefits of integration; and
- Guiding principles for integration.

Finally, there are a few areas that are included in some charters that may not be helpful to the effort, for a variety of reasons. They may predetermine the outcome of the initiative before any study has been done, they may hinder the efficiency of operation by imposing requirements that are unnecessary, or they may limit the flexibility of leaders in getting the job done. These areas should not be included in the charter unless they are necessary to ensure its adoption.

- Rules for conducting business;
- Technical architecture; and
- Subcommittee structure.

Samples of all the charters that have been collected by SEARCH are contained in Appendix D: Integration Planning Materials from Other Jurisdictions, and on the SEARCH web site.

## 5. Mission

A *mission statement* is a concise declaration of the purpose and responsibilities of an organization; why it exists, what it does, and for whom. Integration policy groups have similar missions in every jurisdiction, with minor differences that are based on the organizational structure of the justice enterprise, the scope of the information sharing effort, the integration model or architecture that has been selected, and distribution of work responsibilities between staff assigned to the policy group and participating agencies. The following sample mission statement was derived from a number of the best statements developed by integration policy groups in various locations.

The mission of the Integration Policy Group is to:

- Plan and manage the integration of the justice enterprise;
- Establish policy, priorities, standards, procedures, and architecture;
- Provide leadership, guidance, encouragement, and direction to the information sharing initiative;
- Promote the integration concept within the justice community and with funding bodies and other government entities across all branches and levels of government;
- Direct the development of integration applications and support services.

Some jurisdictions have developed mission statements for the justice enterprise, rather than for the policy group. This approach is appropriate if the policy group has responsibility for oversight of justice system activities beyond the integration initiative, as is the case in some states.

## 6. Vision

*Vision* is a description of an organization's desired future. It reflects an idealized view of how the justice system will operate when all of the objectives of the integration initiative have been accomplished. It represents a target state of operation — the ultimate goal of integration.

Vision statements should be both aspirational and inspirational. They reflect a wide variety of approaches and levels of detail. Some include a detailed narrative of how justice officials use the integrated system – a *concept of operations*. Others offer short, declarative statements of system characteristics.

When it is not practical, realistic, and achievable, vision is merely hallucination. Some vision statements are inherently flawed because they suggest unattainable results. For example, when a vision statement claims that a system will meet all current and future needs of the user community, it suggests that applications can be designed to fulfill unarticulated requirements. When a vision statement asserts that integration is possible without replacing applications, adding staff, or spending money, it ignores the magnitude of change necessary to succeed. When it alleges that applications can be sufficiently flexible to adapt easily to all new technologies, it demonstrates a critical naivety concerning technology evolution. Creating unrealistic expectations in a vision statement can be a fatal error in an integration initiative.

The following sample vision statement was derived from planning materials from a number of state and local integration efforts.

Our vision of the future is:

- an effectively administered and technology-enabled justice enterprise that is swift and fair, controlling and reducing crime, and enhancing the safety, security, and quality of life of all citizens;
- justice system officials making better decisions based on complete, accurate, and timely information (data, documents, images, etc.) that is immediately available, where and when it is needed, without regard to time or location;
- justice organizations having access to all pertinent information concerning offenders: identification and all aliases; current legal status (e.g., outstanding warrants, all pending cases, probation or parole status, restraining orders); and history (e.g., arrests, prosecutions, convictions, and sentences for

felonies, misdemeanors, and other offenses);

- all justice and justice-related organizations exchanging information electronically in a standard format, rather than on paper, minimizing human effort and redundant data entry, and maximizing breadth of distribution, speed of communication, and organizational productivity; which ensures greater efficiency of operations, accuracy of information, and economy in the use of public resources;
- justice system officials being automatically and immediately notified if any event (arrest, case filing, release from custody, etc.) occurs that involves an individual with whom they are involved;
- public policy decisions being enhanced by the availability of comprehensive, timely, reliable, and system-wide statistical information; and
- all justice and justice-related organizations complying with business process, information, and technology standards that they collaboratively developed and maintain, and coordinating integration plans with business and IT plans of the individual organizations.

The following example from the state of Vermont illustrates the *concept of operations* approach to a vision statement.

“Our future vision for criminal justice integration is one where law enforcement officers throughout the state have access from their vehicles to state and federal databases that provide them with the information they need to perform their duties more efficiently and safely. The officer’s ability to make situational assessments will be improved because s/he will have access to warrants, outstanding relief from abuse orders, conditions of parole or release and mug shots from criminal records repositories in Vermont and other states via the FBI, INS and other federal sources. The officer will have a global positioning device to allow for crime mapping and sharing of positional information with other interested parties such as state and federal highway accident reporting programs who use this

data to target road improvements. If the officer makes an arrest, the information s/he enters will be sent over secure computer networks to the State Attorney's case management computer system. Pertinent information from the arrest record will also be shared with the Office of the Defender General and sent to the Vermont Crime Information Center (VCIC) to begin to write the criminal record. The State Attorney will prosecute the case by electronically filing with the Courts, using a common data dictionary to describe the criminal offense. This dictionary will be used by all criminal justice agencies in the state and will be updated as national standards are adopted. The Courts will electronically notify all parties of hearing dates and when the hearing takes place, the judge will have online access to the defendant's records including the arrest record and any outstanding warrants. If the defendant is a repeat offender, the judge may also electronically receive any past violations of parole, and personal incarceration history from the Department of Corrections. As the hearing or trial progresses, and preliminary and final judgments occur, they will be electronically sent to VCIC for updating the criminal record. The judge electronically signs other criminal justice documents such as relief from abuse orders, violations of probation or conditions of parole, warrants and sex offender registry information. These items are immediately available to law enforcement agencies and become part of the criminal record. If the offender is to be incarcerated the mittimus with charge and sentencing information will be sent electronically to the Department of Corrections (DOC) for them to create or add on to the offender's corrections record. If the offender is sentenced to community service the electronic record will be sent to the appropriate parole board. DOC will electronically update and share the prisoner records with local and federal agencies such as Social Service agencies for child protection and child support, the IRS and others.

## **7. Values**

Values are beliefs or principles that guide justice system officials in the performance of their duties and pursuit of their goals. They are important to strategic planning because they may highlight cultural differences between justice disciplines that must be addressed if system leaders are to work together effectively. For example, typical integration efforts include issues relating to whether or not information should be made public. The same information, which at the front and back end of the process may be considered confidential, is public

record during adjudication of a court case. As justice system leaders communicate and understand these differences, they can be more successful at the enterprise level.

By articulating value statements separately, the integration policy group can avoid confusion and save time when defining mission, vision, goals, etc. Many integration plans lack focus or are overly complex because they confuse values with these other elements of the strategic plan.

Value statements are short declarations of the most important principles that guide the justice enterprise. The following list of samples is lengthy; a strategic plan should contain only a small number of the highest priority value statements.

- We acknowledge the independence of the justice and justice-related organizations participating in the integration initiative, while recognizing the interdependence of their operations — no one justice organization can operate effectively without the cooperation of the others.
- We value the efforts of federal, state, and local governments to plan for the future and encourage integration solutions that are consistent with those efforts.
- We appreciate the work currently being done at the national level to develop functional, process, information, and technical standards and seek their implementation in our justice enterprise as quickly as practical.
- We respect the privacy, due process, and other rights of all citizens under the United States and state constitutions.
- We seek to protect the confidentiality of investigatory and deliberative processes to ensure the effective operation of the justice system.
- We understand and support the constitutional mandate of open and public trials and recognize that records of those actions also should be available to the public as defined by federal and state law.
- We realize the necessity of protecting information, networks, and equipment from unauthorized access to ensure the integrity of justice information.



- We accept the responsibility to be accountable for the performance of the justice system and for proper stewardship of public funds and other resources.
- We will provide services that contribute to public trust and confidence in the justice system.
- We recognize the need for innovation and creativity in planning and developing integration technology.
- We seek opportunities to collaborate and cooperate with justice and justice-related organizations at all levels of government to enhance the performance of the justice system as a whole.
- We understand the need to develop technology tools that minimize cost and maximize effectiveness of justice operations.

## 8. Strategic Issues

Strategic issues are fundamental trends, events, and policy choices that influence the ability of the justice enterprise to achieve its mission, vision, and goals. Strategic issues generally involve conflict over what to do, how to do it, how fast to do it, who should do it, and who should pay for it. They represent general directions, rather than routine problems or specific operational obstacles, and may be internal or external to the justice system. They should be addressed so justice organizations have a common understanding of the environment in which they are planning, and so that plans that are developed address all potential obstacles realistically.

Strategic issues will vary from location to location. The list developed by the integration policy group should be placed in priority order, with only the most significant issues included in the strategic plan. The following are samples of strategic issues that may be relevant in many integration initiatives:

- Because the growth of revenues available to state and local governments is not keeping pace with the cost of providing services, increases in resources to support integration initiatives may be difficult to obtain.
- There will be tension between state and local governments over who should fund elements of the integration initiative, particularly when required enhancements to internal systems are seen as

primarily benefiting external organizations.

- The major political parties do not agree on approaches and priorities for justice initiatives, but bi-partisan support for integration is necessary if needed resources and legislative mandates are to be obtained.
- Citizens are independent and prefer not to centralize government functions and information unless absolutely necessary.
- Justice agencies perform competing and often conflicting roles in processing offenders and cases, which could influence the ability of these organizations to work together to automate information exchange.
- Many justice organizations are led by independently elected officials who may have differing views about the importance and priority of participating in the integration initiative. As elected and appointed officials change, disruption of integration efforts may occur.
- Rapid technological advances will pose a challenge to integration in government organizations that are not able to move quickly, as solutions may become obsolete before they can be fully developed and implemented.

## 9. Goals

Goals are specific statements of continuing intended results. They define the day-to-day business, the routine in the operation of the integrated system. They should be specific, concise, and measurable.

There are literally hundreds of goals that could be defined for an integration effort — the integration policy group should select those that reflect areas of greatest need and that will show the greatest accomplishment. It is also helpful to group goals into categories.

Appendix D: Integration Planning Materials from Other Jurisdictions contains goals from integration efforts from around the nation. The following list of samples further illustrates the type of goals that can be established for integration.

- The justice enterprise will develop and implement common identifiers for persons, cases, and key events that will be used in all justice system applications to facilitate access and electronic exchange of information.
- The justice enterprise will develop, implement, and maintain a uniform table of state and local offense codes that will be used in all justice system applications.
- Every justice organization will flag all electronic records associated with serious habitual offenders.
- The justice enterprise will make all key case and offender information available electronically to appropriate justice organizations.
- The state will provide a secure communications network to connect all justice and justice-related organizations. This network will have sufficient bandwidth to support query/response, data and document exchange, and subscription/notification transactions.
- The justice enterprise will minimize redundant data collection, entry, and storage by exchanging information electronically.
- The justice enterprise will identify and analyze all information exchanges between stakeholder organizations and automate those that occur with sufficient frequency to justify the cost.
- Justice organizations will modify existing applications to conform to integration standards within three years.
- The justice enterprise will increase disposition matching with arrests to 95 percent within three years, and 99 percent within five years.
- The justice enterprise will eliminate all backlogs of information transfer and entry within two years.

## 10. Operational Requirements

Business planning focuses on strategies for improvement, while systems planning focuses on functional requirements. Integration planning centers on operational requirements, or the particular needs associated with moving information between organizations.

Operational requirements are specific performance goals for the integrated system. They define information exchanges by the provider or custodian of the information, the recipients of the transaction, the nature (or content) of the exchange, the maximum time acceptable to deliver the information, and the currency of the data being transferred. Since a detailed analysis of information exchange has not been conducted at this point in the planning process, the operational requirements represent a baseline measure of user needs against which future accomplishments can be compared.

Several states have developed extensive lists of operational requirements, most of which relate to responses to inquiries. Similar requirements should be defined for data transfers and notifications. The following samples have been supplied by Michigan, Oklahoma, and Montana. See Appendix D: Integration Planning Materials from Other Jurisdictions for a complete list.

- Every Montana criminal justice agency shall be able to determine the Montana correctional status (incarcerated, on parole, on probation, under community services or correctional supervision) within two minutes, with status currency of 24 hours.
- Every Montana criminal justice agency shall be able to obtain the Montana criminal history record of a person who has one, within 4 minutes, with history currency of 24 hours.
- Every Michigan public safety agency shall be able to obtain a record through an inquiry by name and date of birth, of a person who has one, within 1 minute and to the officer within 2 minutes, with history currency of 24 hours. The records received should include all those records available in the current LEIN, Criminal History, SOS, NLETS, NCIC and III files.
- Every public safety agency with a live scan terminal connected to the state shall receive positive fingerprint identification within 2 hours of the submission.

- Every law enforcement agency shall be able to forward to the appropriate criminal justice agency a warrant request for electronic review, approval and entry into the LEIN system.
- Every public safety agency should be able to determine pre-adjudication information including pending charges, bail and bond release, and conditions within 24 hours accuracy.
- Every public safety agency should have the capability to download records from all centrally held databases with security established according to legal capabilities. Reporting and analysis capability down to the ORI level with security to provide the potential for ad-hoc reporting.
- Every public safety agency shall have access to a newly created, centrally held image repository. This repository shall maintain mugshots, palm prints and images of scars, marks and tattoos. This information shall be returned to a search request as a supplement to the CHRIS.
- Each public safety agency shall have the general ability as an authorized subscriber to information regarding a broad range of actions taken associated with specific people, cases and addresses. These include: (1) The ability to subscribe to activity on registered records, (2) The ability to subscribe to additional activity on investigation systems (STATIS) and inquiries. (3) Electronic notification of justice agency actions. (4) Notification of court actions, prosecutor actions, etc.
- Each public safety agency shall have a minimum capability to capture and submit electronic records to the state repository.
- Every public safety agency will have available to them all centrally held databases a minimum of 99% of the time.
- 1) Every Oklahoma criminal justice agency shall be able to determine if a person is the subject of an Oklahoma warrant and VPO within one minute, with warrants and VPO currency of three hours.

- 6) The Oklahoma criminal history system will include a history of each reception to and discharge from any correctional facility, parole, probation and post-sentence supervision.
- 7) The Oklahoma criminal history will include a final disposition for each charge of each arrest; a final disposition is a decline to prosecute, conviction, acquittal, dismissal, and for convictions it will also include the sentence.
- 8) Every Oklahoma criminal justice agency shall be able to exchange electronic mail (e-mail) with any other Oklahoma criminal justice agency.
- 9) Each Oklahoma criminal justice agency shall have access to a case management system suitable for its in-agency use and for preparing and transmitting required reports to every criminal justice agency.

## 11. Plan for Stage II Planning Activities

A number of planning activities must next be carried out by specialized groups of justice system practitioners. The integration policy group should determine which projects should be included in this process, based on the recommendations of this report and any additional ideas that may be generated during the first phase of planning. The final section of the preliminary strategic plan contains an outline of how this work will be accomplished.

At a minimum, the following information should be provided in the plan:

- A description of the task to be performed;
- Names of individuals assigned to the committee to do the work;
- The date by which it and any intermediate tasks should be completed;
- Any budget amounts or other resources allocated to the project; and
- A description of the final product that should be produced.

This will be the concluding section of the preliminary strategic plan; it will not be included in the final plan. Subsequent sections listed below are not part of the preliminary plan, but are included in the final version.

## 12. Integration Needs and Readiness Assessment

### *Needs Assessment*

The purpose of the needs assessment is to quantify problems with information flow in the justice system. Do justice system officials have all of the right information that they need when they make a decision? How much confidence do they have in that information. Can the problems that are documented be fixed by the integration initiative?

The efficiency of the justice system is another issue that is addressed in the needs assessment. How much effort is wasted capturing information from paper documents and entering it into information systems—information that is already in electronic form in other locations? What are the nature and magnitude of delays in the paper flow pipeline? These and similar questions should be addressed in this section.

This section of the report should contain an analysis of the results of the integration needs assessment. It should summarize the conclusions that can be drawn from the information that was collected, and should be as concise as possible. Detailed data from survey responses, if it is included in the strategic plan, should be attached as an appendix.

### *Readiness Assessment*

The readiness assessment is similar to the needs assessment described in the previous subsection, but addresses a different set of questions. Like the needs assessment section of the strategic plan, the readiness assessment should contain a succinct, policy-level summary of conclusions that can be drawn from the data collected from justice agencies. Detailed survey results are best placed in an appendix or omitted from the report.

Readiness for integration includes a number of factors. Technology issues are less important to this evaluation; they are addressed in the next section of the plan. More vital are organizational, political, and cultural questions. At the organizational level, an agency that already collects statewide data in a common format at a centralized location is in a much better position to participate in integration than a justice function that is county-based, with no automation. In every state, some justice disciplines are more advanced in their use of technology than others are. A diffuse and decentralized operation still can play an important role in an integrated system; it simply will require more time and effort to get to that point.

The political and cultural climate also is an important consideration that should be addressed by the analysis. If the leaders of key justice system components are not interested in integration, it will be much more difficult to move forward. For example, some local law enforcement agencies may be perfectly satisfied with a paper-based system. As long as there are a significant number of other agencies

interested in participating, particularly the ones that handle a high volume of cases, it is safe to proceed. Unwilling leaders may change their minds as they see the benefits of success in other parts of the enterprise.

Other organizations may simply lack the technical competence to participate, even though they are willing. These agencies present different challenges that can be addressed.

In short, this section of the strategic plan should tell policy leaders about the readiness of the justice enterprise to proceed with integration. In some instances, there are problems that cannot be overcome in the short term. The policy group can use this information to craft a strategy to work around the seemingly insurmountable issues.

### **13. Review of Current Technology Environment**

This section of the strategic plan should contain a policy-level summary of conclusions drawn from the survey of technology use in the justice environment. It should cover three areas: infrastructure, applications, and interfaces. It should be a description of the current, “as is” system, and may describe the gaps between this current system and the vision statements created earlier in the planning process. Comprehensive detail should not be included in the plan—the description should simply describe what was done, the general level of response by justice agencies, and significant conclusions that affect the priority of projects that will be conducted following publication of the plan.

### **14. Analysis of Information Exchange**

The integration policy group must initiate three types of projects following strategic planning efforts. First, they must correct deficiencies in the current infrastructure to allow information exchange to occur. Second, they must institute or upgrade applications so that justice organizations have the proper electronic information to move through the system. Third, they must identify the highest priority exchanges for automation. The analysis of information exchange provides the information to help the policy group determine these priorities.

The JIEM modeling tool can provide hundreds of pages of documentation that can be used by system designers and engineers, as well as operations experts, to design electronic interfaces and appropriate modifications to business practices. This section of the strategic plan is not the place for that information to be published. Rather, it should contain a summary of the highest priority exchanges for automation, based on frequency, urgency, importance, and other factors. The JIEM software helps project staff sort out these issues.

Ultimately, the selection of which electronic interfaces to develop first is a policy and political decision. Project work and benefits should be spread throughout the justice community, not concentrated in a single discipline or organization, if support for integration is to remain high. This section of the plan should provide



the information needed by the integration policy group to make these hard decisions.

## **15. Standards Development**

This section of the report describes progress of the standards development group to work out common tables, fields, and codes to describe justice information. It should contain recommended standards that have been completed by the committee that are ready for policy group adoption. It should explain how input can be provided by justice officials throughout the state for suggested modifications. Finally, it should describe a process for continued maintenance of all data standards.

It is recommended that standards adopted by the policy group also be published on an integration web site so that all justice agencies in the state can have access to them. New standards can be placed on the web site for public comment, to help ensure wide acceptance. Updates to standards also should be posted and an e-mail notification system should be developed to ensure that key individuals in justice organizations know about changes as soon as possible.

Finally, a maintenance process should describe how the committee will monitor implementation of the standards throughout the state.

## **16. Information Policy**

This section of the plan should contain a summary of issues addressed by the information policy committee, along with proposed policy to address those issues. The integration policy group should review and approve all such policies before their release and publication.

The information policy committee, like the data standards committee, will continue to fill a role in the integration initiative long after publication of the strategic plan. It should also develop a plan for its ongoing work and distribution of new and amended policies, which should be included in this section.

## **17. Integration Architecture**

This section of the plan should contain the blueprint for integration — the architecture. It should explain, at a non-technical level, how applications will share information through a common infrastructure. It should describe, in conceptual terms, how the integrated system will work.

The architecture that is adopted likely will combine features from a number of architectural models described elsewhere in this report. The explanation that is conveyed here must, of necessity, be simplified so that it can be understood by policy leaders, members of the legislature, and local government officials. The strategic plan must remain strategic. Technical details can be communicated to justice organizations in a different document.

## **18. Communication Planning**

This section of the strategic plan should contain the communication and education plan developed by the communication planning committee. Because a relatively small number of individuals will participate directly, and because integration requires broad support throughout the justice community to succeed, the communications plan is very important. To maintain enthusiasm and momentum, a great deal of effort must be expended in this area for many years to come. The plan should detail long-term efforts to keep the integration agenda on the front burner of the justice enterprise.

## **19. Prioritized Project List**

The climax of the strategic planning process is the creation of a list of projects that will create integration in the state. These projects address the construction or enhancement of infrastructure to support integration, the implementation or refinement of justice system technology applications to share data, and the development of interfaces between applications, using the standards adopted by the policy group.

Strategic planning involves hard choices made jointly by the leaders of organizations that will feel the consequences of those decisions most directly. Every choice to do something is a choice not to do many other things. The strategic plan should provide rational justification for the projects that are selected as highest priority, and show the order of subsequent activities, so other agencies will know when their turn will come. For these reasons, this must be the most carefully articulated section of the strategic plan.

## **20. Strategic Plan Implementation**

The strategic plan should show how the integration policy group and its various committees will work to implement the plan. There should be a schedule of future meetings to monitor and review progress, to develop strategy for legislative and related sessions, and to solve problems.

The strategic plan should outline responsibility for developing action plans for the highest priority activities. Action plans, as a general rule, should be developed by those who will be tasked with doing the work. If any action plans are ready in time, they can be published with the strategic plan.

Finally, this section of the plan should describe a process for updating the strategic plan after two or three years of activity. Over time, priorities change, new technologies and methodologies will emerge, and leadership will change. For the strategic plan to be relevant and to be owned by justice system officials, it must be revised from time to time. The strategic plan should outline when and how this will occur.

## **21. Strategic Management of Integration**

Once strategic planning is complete, the integration policy group must redirect its activities from planning to management. Although project management for many tasks may rest in the agencies doing the work, the policy group should help enforce accountability. If integration staff is added to the effort, the policy group also will be responsible for hiring and managing those individuals. At that point, more direct involvement, particularly by the executive committee of the policy group, will be necessary. It is helpful for the strategic plan to outline how the policy group intends to address these issues and manage the integration effort long term.

**Appendix D:  
Integration Planning  
Materials from Other  
Jurisdictions**

## Integration Planning Materials from Other Jurisdictions

The following information was extracted from SEARCH integration profiles housed on the SEARCH web site.<sup>12</sup> It includes selected mission statements, vision statements, and lists of objectives provided by staff from state and local integration jurisdictions, as well as charter and governance data. Information is correct only as far as it has been supplied and maintained by the submitting site.

### Alabama

#### *Office of Law Enforcement Systems Integrations and Standards (LESIS)*

*Governance:* LESIS Board of Directors

The Executive Director is appointed by the Governor and works with the Board in developing a strategic plan, standards and policy for information integration. The Board has developed by-laws for the operation of LESIS. The Board has a Chair and Vice-Chair. There are two standing committees: the Technical Committee and the Operations Committee. Operations Committee: policy decisions and operations of LESIS. Technical Committee: infrastructure needs, standards, and data dictionary.

*Charter:* Executive Order 21

WHEREAS, the State of Alabama does not currently have a strategic plan for the integration and standardization of communications and data-sharing systems between law enforcement agencies within the state; and

WHEREAS, a statewide strategic plan for integrating information systems in the criminal justice community would promote greater efficiency of operations, greater accuracy of information, and greater economy in the use of public resources; and

WHEREAS, public safety can be improved by making more timely, accurate, and complete information concerning offenders available statewide to all criminal justice agencies and to individual decision makers in the system including police officers, judges, and corrections officers; and

WHEREAS, technical and administrative standards are needed to promote information sharing by addressing compatibility, interoperability, and integration issues for federal, state and local computer information systems; and

WHEREAS, productivity of criminal justice agencies can be improved by reducing redundant data collection and input efforts among the agencies and by reducing or eliminating paper-based processing; and

WHEREAS, better statistical measures for evaluating public policy will improve decision making by government officials relating to the reduction and control of crime problems; and

WHEREAS, a standardized communications system is needed to share routine and emergency information between law enforcement agencies and between jurisdictions; and

WHEREAS, improved coordination is needed between criminal justice and social service agencies focusing on drug interdiction, child abuse, juvenile justice and domestic violence issues; and

WHEREAS, a coordinated plan within Alabama to improve information sharing among criminal justice agencies will establish eligibility for federal grant assistance under the Crime Identification Act of 1998, and it is in the public's interest for departments and agencies of government to work cooperatively and collectively to address these issues.

---

<sup>12</sup> At [http://www.search.org/integration/state\\_map.asp](http://www.search.org/integration/state_map.asp).

NOW THEREFORE, I, Don Siegelman, Governor of the State of Alabama, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of Alabama, and for other good and valid reasons, which relate thereto, do hereby create the Office of Law Enforcement Systems Integration and Standards hereinafter referred to as "LESIS".

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that the purpose of LESIS shall be to address each of the above enumerated issues and develop a statewide strategy for an integrated criminal justice system.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that LESIS shall establish liaison with law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies in Alabama to facilitate appropriate use of information sharing and other technologies to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the criminal justice system.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that the Alabama Law Enforcement Technology Alliance (ALET) Board shall coordinate with and offer guidance to the LESIS office.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that this office should address data sharing and other technology issues and shall be governed by a board of directors consisting of the following members:

1. Five members to be appointed by the Governor;
2. The Director of the Department of Public Safety or his designee;
3. The Director of Administrative Office of Courts or his designee;
4. The Director of Criminal Justice Information Center or his designee;
5. The Director of Alabama Department of Economic and Community Affairs or his designee;
6. The Director of the Department of Transportation or his designee;
7. The Director of the Department of Corrections or his designee; and
8. The Chief Information Officer or his designee; and
9. The Attorney General of the State of Alabama or his designee.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that the director of LESIS shall execute the decisions of the LESIS Board and shall serve at the pleasure of the Governor.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that the Board of Directors shall, at the first meeting, elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that LESIS shall be a temporary office with an initial two year period of existence that begins once the office is fully staffed and begins operation.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that LESIS shall be staffed as determined by the director not to exceed six full-time persons on temporary assignment from state criminal justice agencies. These staff shall remain on their agency's payroll, but shall be assigned to this office for all duties.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that LESIS shall have the authority to enter into contracts as state law allows.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that LESIS may operate from facilities provided by the Alabama Criminal Justice Information Center and the director of LESIS shall report quarterly to the Governor regarding progress of this office's initiatives.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that LESIS is empowered with the authority to develop funding requests from federal, state, and local government sources, as well as, private sources to further the purposes of this office, and coordinate any such requests with the Governor's Office.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, all state agencies that interact with the criminal justice system, including but not limited to; the Department of Alabama Economic and Community Affairs, the ABC Board, the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Youth Services, the Department of Public Safety, Board of Pardons and Parole, Department of Human Resources, Department of Conservation, and the Revenue Department; shall co-operate fully with this office and provide information as necessary to meet the purposes of this office.

BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that this Executive Order shall become effective immediately upon the Governor's signature and shall remain in effect until amended or modified by the Governor.

DONE AND ORDERED this 14th day of March, 2000.

#### *Mission*

To establish and maintain a seamless integrated system that maximizes standardization of data, communications technology and information generation among the primary communities of interest.

#### *Vision*

It is the vision of LESIS that the information technology of all state and local governmental agencies are sufficiently and optimally coordinated such that the state is able to take full advantage of current and anticipated future technology in communications, data entry, data transmission, information generation and information delivery to the point where it is needed at the time when it is needed.

#### *Objectives*

Develop a strategic plan for the integration and standardization of communications and data sharing systems between law enforcement agencies within the state.

Implement the statewide strategic plan for integrating information systems in the criminal justice community to promote greater efficiency of operations, greater accuracy of information, and greater economy in the use of public resources.

Improve public safety by developing the standards and infrastructure for making more timely, accurate, and complete information concerning offenders available statewide to all criminal justice agencies and to individual decision makers in the system including police officers, judges, and corrections officers.

Develop technical and administrative standards to promote information sharing by addressing compatibility, interoperability, and integration issues for federal, state and local computer information systems.

Improve productivity of criminal justice agencies reducing redundant data collection and input efforts among the agencies and by reducing or eliminating paper-based processing.

Improve decision making by government officials relating to the reduction and control of crime problems through the means of better statistical measures for evaluating public policy.

Assure the evolution and development of a standardized communications system to share routine and emergency information between law enforcement agencies and between jurisdictions.

Improve coordination between criminal justice and social service agencies focusing on drug interdiction, child abuse, juvenile justice and domestic violence issues.

Develop a coordinated plan within Alabama to improve information sharing among criminal justice agencies to establish eligibility for federal grant assistance under the Crime Identification Act of 1998, and assure that departments and agencies of government to work cooperatively and collectively to address these issues in the public's interest.

### **Alaska**

#### ***Alaska Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Information Advisory Board

Administration Department	Department of Administration, Information Technology Group
Corrections	Department of Corrections
Courts	Alaska Court System
Department of Motor Vehicles	Division of Motor Vehicles, Dept. of Administration
Judicial	Alaska Judicial Council

Juvenile Justice	Div. of Juvenile Justice, Department of Health and Social Services
Local Law Enforcement	Alaska Association of Chiefs of Police
Prosecution	Department of Law -- Criminal Division
Prosecution	Anchorage Municipal Prosecutor
Public	Public Member
Public Defense	Public Defender Agency
Public Safety	Department of Public Safety
Social Services	Department of Health and Social Services
State Courts	State Supreme Court

*Charter:* AS §12.62.100. Criminal Justice Information Advisory Board; Functions and Duties.

(A) The Criminal Justice Information Advisory Board is established in the department. The board consists of the following members:

- (1) a member of the general public appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the governor;
- (2) a municipal police chief appointed by and serving at the pleasure of the governor; in making this appointment, the governor shall consult with the Alaska Association of Chiefs of Police;
- (3) the attorney general or the attorney general's designee;
- (4) the chief justice of the supreme court or the chief justice's designee;
- (5) the commissioner of administration or the commissioner's designee;
- (6) the commissioner of corrections or the commissioner's designee;
- (7) the commissioner of health and social services or the commissioner's designee;
- (8) the commissioner of public safety or the commissioner's designee, who will serve as chair of the board; and
- (9) the executive director of the Alaska Judicial Council or the executive director's designee.

(B) Members of the board receive no compensation for services on the board, but are entitled to per diem and travel expenses authorized for boards under AS 39.20.180.

(C) The board shall meet at least once every six months.

(D) The board shall advise the department and other criminal justice agencies on matters pertaining to the development and operation of the central repository described in AS 12.62.110(1) and other criminal justice information systems, including providing advice about regulations and procedures, and estimating the resources and costs of those resources, needed to carry out the provisions of this chapter.

### *Mission*

Make criminal justice more effective by simplifying procedures to create, access, and exchange complete, accurate, and timely information.

### *Vision*

Nobody gets hurt for lack of complete, accurate, timely criminal justice information. Alaska envisions a network of computer applications and databases that:

1. Includes state of the art applications suited to the particular mission of each agency;
2. Directly and effectively improves criminal justice, juvenile justice, and child protection operations (not simply serves as record keeping mechanisms);
3. Automatically collects and shares information as a by-product of normal operations (with little or no additional data entry effort);



4. Provides practitioners (at each point in the justice process) the information needed to make sound and just decisions;
5. Enables authorized practitioners, managers, and policy makers to access high-quality data from anywhere in the criminal justice system, using a single log-in;
6. Enables appropriate public access to criminal justice information, enhancing both public safety and due process; and
7. Uses a telecommunication network that links all agencies and enables them to share data and images.

#### *Objectives*

Leverage resources to identify and locate dangerous, wanted, and missing persons by alerting and enlisting help from more agencies and private citizens through use of a secure intranet and, when appropriate, the Internet, to post electronic fingerprint images, photographs, and other critical information.

Improve criminal justice decision-making ability by reliably providing authorized users with faster access to more information of better quality upon which to base arrest, bail, prosecution, adjudication, sentencing, correctional supervision, and employment/licensing decisions.

Improve public policy decision-making ability by producing planned, readable, consistent, system-wide criminal justice statistics that are based on shared definitions and occur as a by-product of agency operations, rather than an afterthought that requires additional programming.

Balance public safety versus individual privacy interests by enabling all Alaskan criminal justice agencies to achieve full compliance with local, state, and federal laws that require collection and restrict use of criminal justice information.

Improve customer service by providing information in an easy-to-read format that can be understood without specialized training, and by reducing the time and cost to the consumer by allowing "one-stop shopping" instead of requiring multiple agency requests and fees for information concerning a single case, event, or person.

Make government operations more efficient by eliminating or reducing paper-based case processing and redundant data entry by entities other than the originating agency.

Minimize costs of initial development and future enhancements by adhering to clearly defined international, then national, then state standards, unless a reason for departure from a standard is articulated and formally agreed upon by all agencies.

Make government agencies more accountable by automating audit functions to quantify and analyze workload statistics, generate regular reports measuring improvements (or lack thereof) in data quality and timeliness, and detect and report breaches in security and other record processing rules.

## **Arizona**

### ***Arizona Criminal Justice Integrated Information System***

*Governance:* Arizona Criminal Justice Commission

The governance structure is broken down into four levels: (1) Arizona Criminal Justice Commission; (2) Executive Steering Committee (develops and approves policies concerning the statewide integration efforts); (3) Funding Team, (seeks state and federal funding to pay for statewide integration) Technical Team, (creates the statewide integration model) and Policy Team (reviews and creates policies to govern statewide integration efforts); and (4) Tactical Team (tests and advises on statewide integration model that will be implemented).

Corrections	Arizona Department of Corrections
Information Services	Government Information Technology Agency
Probation Department	Probation Department
Prosecution	County Attorney's Offices

Public	Arizona Department of Public Safety
State Court Administration	Arizona Administrative Office of the Courts
State Courts	Arizona State Supreme Court
State Law Enforcement	State Law Enforcement

*Charter:* Arizona Revised Statutes § 41-2405.

Arizona criminal justice commission; powers and duties; staff

A. The Arizona criminal justice commission shall:

1. Monitor the progress and implementation of new and continuing criminal justice legislation.
2. Facilitate information and data exchange among criminal justice agencies.
3. Establish and maintain criminal justice system information archives.
4. Prepare for the governor an annual criminal justice system review report. The report shall contain:
  - (a) An analysis of all criminal justice programs created by the legislature in the preceding two years.
  - (b) An analysis of the effectiveness of the criminal code, with a discussion of any problems and recommendations for revisions if deemed necessary.
  - (c) A study of the level of activity in the several areas of the criminal justice system, with recommendations for redistribution of criminal justice revenues if deemed necessary.
  - (d) An overall review of the entire criminal justice system including crime prevention, criminal apprehension, prosecution, court administration and incarceration at the state and local levels as well as funding needs for the system.
  - (e) Recommendations for constitutional, statutory and administrative revisions that are necessary to develop and maintain a cohesive and effective criminal justice system.
5. Provide supplemental reports on criminal justice issues of special timeliness.
6. Evaluate and gather information concerning potential and existing programs designed to effectuate community crime prevention using citizen participation and disseminate that information to the public, political subdivisions, law enforcement agencies and the legislature.
7. Make recommendations to the legislature and the governor each year, pursuant to paragraph 4 of this subsection, regarding the purposes and formula for allocation of fund monies as provided in section 41-2401, subsection D and section 41-2402.
8. Adopt rules for the purpose of allocating fund monies as provided in sections 41-2402 and 41-2407 that are consistent with the purposes set forth in those sections and that promote effective and efficient use of the monies.
9. With other agencies of government, coordinate the development, implementation and assessment of programs for alcohol and drug enforcement, education, prevention and treatment.
10. Make reports to the governor and the legislature as they require.
11. In relation to the criminal justice information system established in chapter 17 of this title:
  - (a) Establish the technical criteria to be followed for connecting a component information system to the system.
  - (b) Adopt rules for the administration and management of the system.
  - (c) Conduct hearings to adjudicate disputes between criminal justice agencies if the dispute concerns lack of compliance by either of such agencies with rules relating to the system adopted by the commission.
  - (d) Receive petitions for review of criminal history record information from the subject of the information, conduct hearings to determine the accuracy of the information concerning the subject and amend the

criminal history record information if inaccurate.

(e) Formulate policies, plans and programs for expansion of the system as needed.

(f) Set developmental priorities for the system.

(g) Develop and submit to the legislature the cost sharing formula for participants in the system.

(h) Provide information to the public on the purposes of the system.

(i) Adopt plans and rules for the privacy, confidentiality and security of the system and the dissemination of criminal history record information.

(j) Oversee the research, analysis, studies, reports and publication of crime and criminal justice statistics prepared by the Arizona statistical analysis center, which is an operating section of the criminal justice commission.

12. Prepare an annual report on law enforcement activities in this state funded by the drug enforcement account or the criminal justice enhancement fund and relating to illicit drugs and drug related gang activity. The report shall be submitted by October 31 of each year to the governor, the president of the senate and the speaker of the house of representatives. The report shall include:

(a) The name and a description of each law enforcement program dealing with illegal drug activity or street gang activity, or both.

(b) The objective and goals of each program.

(c) The source and amount of monies received by each program.

(d) The name of the agency or entity that administers each program.

(e) The effectiveness of each program.

B. The Arizona criminal justice commission may, as necessary to perform its functions:

1. Request any state or local criminal justice agency to submit any necessary information.

2. Form subcommittees, make studies, conduct inquiries and hold hearings.

3. Employ consultants for special projects and such staff as deemed necessary or advisable to carry out this section.

4. Delegate its duties to carry out this section, including:

(a) The authority to enter into contracts and agreements on behalf of the commission.

(b) The authority to appoint, hire, terminate and discipline all personnel of the commission including consultants.

5. Establish joint research and information facilities with governmental and private agencies.

6. Accept and expend public and private grants of monies, gifts and contributions and expend, distribute or allocate monies appropriated to it for the purpose of enhancing efforts to investigate, prosecute and adjudicate serious offenses as defined in section 13-604.

### *Mission*

The Arizona justice information integration project will establish a secure integrated mechanism which enables and encourages the sharing of information among criminal justice agencies. This system will provide accurate, complete, accessible and timely data on individuals and events for criminal justice and non-criminal justice users. The information system will support swift, fair justice and the effective administration of the criminal justice system. It will provide officer, staff and public safety, and promote public policy management in a cost-effective manner.

### ***Maricopa County (Phoenix, AZ) Integrated Criminal Justice Information System***

*Governance:* ICJIS Executive Committee

The governing body for the ICJIS Program is the ICJIS Executive Committee. Its authority and responsibilities are stated in the Governance Agreement. Justice and Law Enforcement Technology Council (JaLET): Primary technology subcommittee, develops technology standards and practices, comprised of IT professionals. Various working groups: Focus on technology or operational area, as directed by the Business Team, comprised of broad-based experts. ICJIS Business Team: provides oversight and direction to project according to Executive Committee policy guidelines, comprised of business and operational leaders.

Clerk of Court	Elected Clerk of Superior Court
Information Services	Liaison with Maricopa County Office of the CIO
Local Court Administration	County Administrator's Office
Local Courts	Superior Court of Arizona, Maricopa County
Local Courts	Justice Courts in Maricopa County
Local Law Enforcement	Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
Other	Liaison with Maricopa County Administrative Officer
Probation Department	Adult and Juvenile Probation Departments
Prosecution	County Attorney's Office
Public Defense	Public Defender's Office
Public Defense	Office of Contract Counsel
Public Defense	Office of Legal Advocate
Public Defense	Legal Defender's Office

*Charter:* Governance Agreement

<http://www.search.org/integration/pdf/MaricopaGovAgrmt.pdf>

#### *Mission*

The Mission of the Integrated Criminal Justice Information System is to enhance public safety, improve service to the community, and promote quality justice and law enforcement decision making by sharing information that is timely, secure, reliable and comprehensive.

#### *Vision*

Integration will allow enhanced productivity, efficiency, communication and will eliminate redundancy. As a result, ICJIS will have a positive impact on improved public safety by making available to criminal justice stakeholders timely, accurate, and complete information concerning offenders. Improved decisions will be made through the increased availability of performance measures relating to public policy. Staff productivity will increase with the elimination of redundant data collection and duplicate data entry. Paper-based processes will be reduced or eliminated with the rapid availability of electronic records. Criminal justice information will be accessible in a timely, accurate, and comprehensive fashion by criminal justice agencies. The public will have access to relevant information.

#### *Objectives*

Improved public information.

Efficient case processing.

Enhanced public safety.

## **Arkansas**

### ***Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems***

*Governance:* Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems Coordinating Council

Local Government Advisory Group: Assess criminal justice processing at local levels of government and provide recommendations on the development of a statewide integrated criminal justice information system. Technical Committee: Assess current and future technical environments, technical policy issues, technical standards, infrastructure and security issues, associated with implementation of IJIS.

*Charter:* Act 1272 of 2001

AN ACT TO ESTABLISH AN ARKANSAS INTEGRATED JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEMS  
COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR THE 2002-2003 BIENNium.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS:

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established the Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems Coordinating Council for the 2002-2003 biennium.

(b) The council shall consist of the directors of:

- (1) the Administrative Office of the Courts;
- (2) the Department of Correction;
- (3) the Department of Community Punishment;
- (4) the Division of Youth Services;
- (5) the Arkansas Crime Information Center;
- (6) the Department of Arkansas State Police;
- (7) the State Crime Laboratory;
- (8) the Department of Information Systems;
- (9) the Office of Prosecutor Coordinator;
- (10) the Arkansas Sentencing Commission; and
- (11) the Arkansas Public Defender Commission.

(c) Council members shall serve without compensation, except for travel and meeting expenses as may be available.

(d) A director may designate a person from within their agency to serve in their place who has the authority to make policy and fiscal decisions in the name of the director.

(e) The council shall elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson from among the members of the council.

(f) The council shall have authority to:

- (1) examine and evaluate the existing justice information systems in Arkansas, to identify alternative solutions and make recommendations for improvements;
- (2) to establish standards relating to technology, privacy, security, and public access;
- (3) to develop specific goals and timetables for a complete integrated justice information system; and
- (4) to perform such related studies or tasks as requested by the Governor, the Chief Justice, the Legislature, or other authorities with similar missions and interests.

SECTION 2. (a)(1) The council shall appoint a standing local government advisory group to collaborate and advise the council on local government integrated justice information system issues and the impact of integrated system policies and decisions on local units of government.

(2) The advisory group shall consist of a sheriff, a chief of police, a prosecuting attorney, a municipal judge, a public defender, a circuit clerk, a member of a city governing body, a county judge and other local government representatives as determined by the council to be necessary to fully represent local government interests.

(3) Members of the advisory group shall serve without compensation, except for travel and meeting

expenses as may be available.

(b) The council may designate other advisory groups as needed to analyze relevant issues and perform necessary studies. Members of such groups shall serve without compensation, except for travel and meeting expenses as may be available.

(c)(1) The council shall submit a report with the council's recommendations to the Governor, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and the Legislative Joint Committee on Advanced Communication and Information Technology no later than September 30, 2002.

(2) The final report shall include a recommendation as to whether a coordinating council should continue to exist.

**SECTION 3.** (a) The Arkansas Crime Information Center shall serve as the primary support agency for the Arkansas Integrated Justice Information Systems Coordinating Council.

(b) The Arkansas Crime Information Center may accept any and all grants, donations, bequests, and devises, conditional or otherwise, of money, property, services, or other things of value which may be received from any governmental agency, or any institution, person, firm, or corporation, public or private, to be held, used, or applied to any of the purposes specified in this act, in accordance with state budgeting, purchasing and accounting procedures on behalf of the Coordinating Council.

#### *Mission*

Coordinating Council's mission is: To create and maintain integrated criminal justice information processing with accurate, complete and timely data on individuals and events, that will promote and support the effective administration of justice in a cost-effective manner at all levels of government in Arkansas.

#### *Objectives*

Capture data at the source event, reducing or eliminating redundant data entry.

Build on existing criminal justice information systems.

Promote consistent standards in criminal justice information systems.

Integrate criminal justice data at all levels and branches of government.

Enhance inter-agency access to adult and juvenile justice data.

Encourage the sharing of communication technology and infrastructure.

Provide guidance on the planning and administration of criminal justice information systems.

Enable more useful management information statistics.

Establish priorities and architectures that will accommodate future integrated justice information systems.

Optimize the funding of criminal justice information systems.

### **California**

#### ***CJIS (tentative)***

##### *Objectives*

Real time information exchange between the courts, district attorney, probation department, public defender, local law enforcement, the sheriff's office, jail operations, booking photographs, state/regional fingerprint systems and state/local automated warrants system with single point of entry where possible.

#### ***Kern County Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

##### *Governance*

When CJIS was first developed, a steering committee of criminal justice department heads in Kern (as well as Marin and San Joaquin) met regularly to provide priorities, funding and a sense of overall commitment

for the project. This group was made up of agency heads from the courts, sheriff's office, prosecutor's office, public defender's office, and probation department.

*Charter:* Informal agreement

*Objectives*

To create a truly integrated criminal justice system where data is shared and redundancy is prevented.

### ***Los Angeles County Consolidated Criminal History Reporting System (CCHRS)***

*Governance:* Information Systems Advisory Board (ISAB)

Initially, the Municipal Court Judges' Association of Los Angeles County. As the need for a consolidated criminal history system became apparent to the other Los Angeles County criminal justice agencies, CCHRS sponsorship was transferred to the Information Systems Advisory Board (ISAB). ISAB is responsible for creating, implementing, and maintaining a long-range systems and communications plan to improve information systems design and ensure the coordinated development of the Los Angeles Justice Information Systems (LAJIS).

Information System	Information Systems Advisory Board
Internal Services	Internal Services Department
Local Court Administration	Association of Trial Court Administrators
Local Courts	Los Angeles County Municipal Courts Planning & Research Unit
Local Courts	Municipal Court Judges' Association
Local Law Enforcement	Los Angeles Police Department
Local Law Enforcement	Sheriff's Department
Local Law Enforcement	Los Angeles Police Chiefs' Association
Probation Department	Probation Department
Prosecution	District Attorney's Office

*Mission*

The purpose of the Consolidated Criminal History Reporting System (CCHRS) is to provide the Los Angeles County criminal justice community with complete, timely and accurate criminal history information in an understandable format.

*Objectives*

Reduce effort and cost expended to assemble a suspect's criminal history

Facilitate suspect identification through use of fingerprint-based information

Improve defendant history information for arrest, bail, filing and sentencing decisions

Improve ability to track serious habitual offenders

### ***Marin County Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

*Objectives*

Continue to enhance CJIS by incorporating new technology. The consortium counties have invested over \$25 million in the development of CJIS. It is an incredibly reliable and functionally pervasive system that serves the needs of the User departments very well. By adding new features, including data warehousing, Web/Internet compatibility, and "windows" functionality, Marin County hopes to extend the life of CJIS for many years to come.

### ***Sacramento County Integrated Justice Information Systems (IJIS) Project***

*Governance:* Sacramento County Criminal Justice Cabinet

The Criminal Justice Cabinet Executive Committee provides project oversight and policy direction. Sacramento County's CIO serves on the Executive Committee specifically for the IJIS Project. He is also a member of the IJIS Steering Committee, which is made up of deputy level administrators from the various departments. This Committee makes major project recommendations to the Executive Committee. The IJIS Technology Committee reports to the Steering Committee, and is composed of IT Manager level individuals from the stakeholder organizations. This Committee provides technical consultation to the Steering Committee. The IJIS Project Manager (who oversees the Project Office) reports to the IJIS Steering Committee. This is also detailed in the IJIS Project Information Strategy Plan. ISP Technical Approach Committee: works out technical strategies for the project. Data Model Committee: creates Data Model.

Administration Department	Public Protection Agency
Local Law Enforcement	Sacramento Police Department
Local Court Administration	County Executive's Office
Local Courts	Superior Court
Local Law Enforcement	Sacramento Sheriff's Department
Probation Department	Probation Department
Prosecution	District Attorney's Office
Public Defense	Public Defender's Office

*Charter:* Charter agreed to by members of Executive Committee

#### *Mission*

The Mission of the Sacramento County Integrated Justice Information Systems Project is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of justice agencies and the Court, enrich the quality of justice, and enhance the safety of Sacramento citizens through the integration and timely sharing of criminal justice information.

#### *Objectives*

Improve access to justice related information.

Improve the timeliness, accuracy and quality of information and the ability to share information among agencies and the court.

Improve efficiency and reduce costs by evaluation of workflow and processes.

Increase information exchange and analysis among departments, agencies, and the court.

Provide users with the systems capabilities necessary to make individual case decisions and to conduct analysis, research and ad hoc reporting.

## **Colorado**

### ***Colorado Integrated Criminal Justice Information System***

#### *Governance:* CICJIS Task Force

The executive directors of the five CICJIS agencies are designated as the CICJIS Task Force and serve as the board of directors for the program. The Chief Officer is appointed jointly by the Governor and Chief Justice to serve as the executive director of the program. The statute allows the executive directors to delegate operational responsibilities to a designated subordinate. All have done so, and these individuals comprise the operational "task force" and are directly involved in the day-to-day operation of the program. Operational Task Force: agency IT Directors have been delegated operational authority by the agency executive directors and function as the program Task Force. Technical Working Group: each agency has technical support staff assigned to work on CICJIS-related activities. This group is responsible for maintaining the existing system infrastructure and developing any new components. Agency User Groups: agency user/advisory groups are consulted on plans for future changes as well as impacts of existing



business practices on interagency data sharing.

Corrections	Colorado Department of Human Services, Division of Youth Corrections (DYC)
Corrections	Colorado Department of Corrections (DOC)
Prosecution	Colorado District Attorneys Council (CDAC)
State Court Administration	State Judicial Branch
State Law Enforcement	Colorado Department of Public Safety, Colorado Bureau of Investigation (CBI)

*Charter:* Colorado Statutes §§ 16-20.5-101 - 16.20.5-103

16-20.5-101 - Short title.

This article and article 21 of this title shall be known and may be cited as the "Criminal Justice Information System Act".

16-20.5-101.5 - Legislative declaration.

(1) The general assembly hereby finds and determines that, since 1974, there have been proposals for an automated criminal justice information system that shares and tracks data concerning offenders among the various criminal justice agencies. Because each of the criminal justice agencies in the state has developed independent information systems to address each agency's own management and planning needs, the status of criminal justice information in the state has been fragmented.

(2) The general assembly hereby declares that this article is enacted for the purpose of developing, in a cost-effective manner, a seamless, integrated criminal justice information system that maximizes standardization of data and communications technology among law enforcement agencies, district attorneys, the courts, and state-funded corrections for adult and youth offenders. Such a system will improve:

- (a) Public safety by making more timely, accurate, and complete information concerning offenders available statewide to all criminal justice agencies and to individual decision-makers in the system including police officers, judges, and corrections officers;
  - (b) Decision-making by increasing the availability of statistical measures for evaluating public policy;
  - (c) Productivity of existing staff by working toward eliminating redundant data collection and input efforts among the agencies and by reducing or eliminating paper-based processing;
  - (d) Access to timely, accurate, and complete information by both staff from all criminal justice agencies and the public when permitted by article 72 of title 24, C.R.S.
- (3) Because information about offenders collected by local law enforcement agencies may be the most current, the general assembly directs criminal justice agencies, where practical, to cooperate with and to encourage local law enforcement agencies to participate in the Colorado integrated criminal justice information system program developed under this article.
- (4) The general assembly hereby finds that the initial plan proposed by the task force created by this article has been approved by the commission on information management, that the Colorado integrated criminal justice information system program is in the beginning stages of implementation, and that the sharing of criminal justice information is being enhanced as a result. The general assembly further finds that there is a need to provide ongoing support and leadership for the development and maintenance of the Colorado integrated criminal justice information system program.

16-20.5-102 - Definitions.

As used in this article, unless the context otherwise requires:

- (1) "CCIC" means the Colorado crime information center.

(2) "Chief officer" means the chief criminal justice information system officer selected pursuant to section 16-20.5-103 responsible for coordinating the implementation of a strategic plan for and maintaining an integrated criminal justice information system, as such term is defined in subsection (3) of this section.

(2.3) "Commission" means the commission on information management created by section 24-30-1701, C.R.S.

(2.5) "Criminal justice agency" means any of the following: The department of public safety, department of corrections, department of human services, judicial department, and Colorado district attorneys council.

(3) "Integrated criminal justice information system" or "system" means an automated information system capable of tracking the complete life cycle of a criminal case throughout its various stages involving different criminal justice agencies through potentially separate and individual systems and without unnecessary duplication of data collection, data storage, or data entry.

16-20.5-103 - Colorado integrated criminal justice information system program - task force.

(1) There is hereby established the Colorado integrated criminal justice information system program, referred to in this article as the "program". The program shall be a joint effort of the criminal justice agencies. The program shall be implemented by the criminal justice information program task force, which is hereby created and referred to in this article as the "task force". Membership of the task force shall be comprised of the executive directors of the department of public safety, department of corrections, department of human services, and Colorado district attorneys council and the state court administrator or their respective designees. The governor and the chief justice of the Colorado supreme court shall jointly designate a member of the task force to serve as the chief officer.

(2) The chief officer and the task force shall be responsible and accountable for the implementation of a uniform policy for an integrated criminal justice information system. The uniform policy shall include a system or systems to enable the criminal justice agencies to share data stored in each other's information system. Initially, the uniform policy shall maximize the use of existing data bases and platforms through the use of a virtual data base created by a network linking existing data bases and platforms among the various departments. The uniform policy shall also develop plans for new open system platforms when the existing platforms become obsolete.

#### *Mission*

The mission of the Colorado Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (CICJIS) is defined in its enabling legislation: H.B. 95-1101, S.B. 96-221 and S.B. 98-180. 16-20.5-101.5, C.R.S. defines the purpose of CICJIS as "developing, in a cost-effective manner, a seamless, integrated criminal justice information system that maximizes standardization of data and communications technology among law enforcement agencies, district attorneys, the courts, and state-funded corrections for adult and youth offenders." CICJIS is an independent program that relies on the equal participation of the five CICJIS agencies. Policy and direction are established by the CICJIS Task Force, which consists of the Executive Directors of the five CICJIS agencies or their designees.

#### *Vision*

The vision of the Colorado Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (CICJIS) is to provide one view of all criminal justice information in a manner that supports and complements the missions of its five constituent agencies. CICJIS strives to provide information in a timely, accurate and reliable manner. CICJIS should evolve to provide technologically neutral access to criminal justice information consistent with the state's Information Technology Vision.

#### *Objectives*

To improve public safety by making more timely, accurate and complete information concerning offenders available statewide to all criminal justice agencies and to individual decision-makers in the system including police officers, judges, district attorneys and corrections officers.

To improve decision-making by increasing the availability of statistical measures for evaluating public policy.

To improve productivity of existing staff by working towards eliminating redundant data collections and

input efforts among the agencies and by reducing or eliminating paper-based processing.

To provide access to timely, accurate, and complete information by criminal justice agencies and the public when permitted by article 72 of title 24, C.R.S.

## **Connecticut**

### ***Connecticut Criminal Justice Information System - Offender Based Tracking System***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Information System Governing Board

The Criminal Justice Information System Governing Board establishes direction and policy on criminal justice information. Agency designees comprise a CJIS Implementation Group that facilitates the coordination of CJIS programs at the project level. In the past, agency participants cooperated on an agency to agency basis until more formally organizing in 1992 when a CJIS Policy Board was established by the Justice Planning Agency. The Policy Board developed carried out the planning for the OBTS. This planning identified the need for an statutorily established policy organization, e.g., a CJIS Governing Board with representation from all participants. An Act Creating a Criminal Justice Information System Governing Board, Public Act 99-14, provides a statutory basis for the Offender Based Tracking System (OBTS) initiative, was signed into law, and became effective on May 12, 1999. Public Act 00-20 added the Office of Victim Advocate to the membership of the Criminal Justice Information System Governing Board. CJIS Policy Committee: develops and provides policy recommendations to the CJIS Governing Board. CJIS Technical Committee: carries out technical coordination and provides technical advice to the CJIS Implementation Group. CJIS Implementation Group: facilitates coordination of CJIS programs at project level.

Corrections	Department of Correction
Department of Motor Vehicles	Department of Motor Vehicles
Information Technology	Department of Information Technology
Local Law Enforcement	Connecticut Police Chiefs Association
Parole	Board of Parole
Policy and Management	Office of Policy and Management, Policy Development and Planning Division
Probation Department	Judicial Branch Court Support Services Division
Prosecution	Division of Criminal Justice, Office of the Chief State's Attorney
Public Defense	Division of Public Defender Services, Office of the Chief Public Defender
Public Safety	Department of Public Safety, Division of State Police
State Court Administration	Office of the Chief Court Administrator
Victim Assistance	Board of Pardons, Office of the Victim Advocate

*Charter:* Public Act 99-14, P.A. 00-20

An Act Establishing a Criminal Justice Information System Governing Board.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 1. (NEW) (a) There shall be a Criminal Justice Information System Governing Board, hereinafter referred to as the governing board, which shall oversee an information system that enables, as determined by the governing board and subject to chapter 961a of the general statutes, criminal justice agencies, as defined in subsection (b) of section 54-142g of the general statutes, to share criminal history record information, as defined in subsection (a) of section 54-142g of the general statutes, and to access electronically maintained offender and case data involving felonies, misdemeanors, violations, motor

vehicle violations, motor vehicle offenses for which a sentence to a term of imprisonment may be imposed, and infractions. For purposes of this section, "offender-based tracking system" shall mean such information system.

(b) The governing board shall be composed of the Chief Court Administrator, who shall serve as chairperson, the Commissioner of Public Safety, the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, the Commissioner of Correction, the chairperson of the Board of Parole, the chairperson of the Board of Pardons, the Chief State's Attorney, the Chief Public Defender, the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Information Technology, the Victim Advocate, the Commissioner of Motor Vehicles and the president of the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association. Each member of the governing board may appoint a designee who shall have the same powers as such member.

(c) The governing board shall meet at least once during each calendar quarter and at such other times as the chairperson deems necessary. A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(d) The duties and responsibilities of the governing board shall be to: (1) Oversee the operations and administration of the offender-based tracking system; (2) establish such permanent and ad hoc committees as it deems necessary, with appointments to such committees not restricted to criminal justice agencies; (3) recommend any legislation necessary for implementation, operation and maintenance of the offender-based tracking system; (4) establish and implement policies and procedures to meet the system-wide objectives, including the provision of appropriate controls for data access and security; and (5) perform all necessary functions to facilitate the coordination and integration of the offender-based tracking system.

(e) A member of the governing board, a member of a permanent or an ad hoc committee established by the governing board, and any person operating and administering the offender-based tracking system shall be deemed to be "state officers and employees" for the purposes of chapter 53 and section 5-141d of the general statutes.

Sec. 2. This act shall take effect from its passage.

#### *Vision*

The OBTS vision is to create an enterprise criminal justice information system that enables participating agencies to exchange information about offenders and their cases, and access electronically-maintained offender and case data as authorized. OBTS is a new system that interfaces with existing agency criminal justice information systems. It integrates agency operational data into an enterprise-wide data repository of offender and case data using pre-determined significant occurrences (events) in the criminal justice process. It therefore reflects the most current electronic offender-case information. OBTS contains business rules that facilitate the exchange and re-use of offender and case information among the criminal justice information systems using event notification messages and electronic intake packages.

#### *Objectives*

The CJIS-OBTS objective is to create an enterprise-wide, integrated criminal justice system that: (1) provides an integrated single-source repository of offender-case data that is accurate, verifiable, timely, and available to all criminal justice agencies as authorized who are involved in all phases of the criminal justice process, (2) informs appropriate criminal justice agencies involved in all phases of the criminal justice process of the occurrence of significant criminal justice events, and (3) provides a scalable, adaptable, and maintainable architecture to accommodate future criminal justice enterprise and operational requirements.

More explicit objectives that represent the expectations of the CJIS-OBTS agencies include: (1) Capture criminal justice data at the source event, (2) Build upon existing agency criminal justice information systems, (3) Transform the agency criminal justice business processes into an enterprise-wide criminal justice business process which is consistent with agency operations, (4) Integrate criminal justice data, (5) Provide succinct and comprehensive offender-case data, enhance criminal justice data accessibility, (6) Implement enterprise event management, and (7) Implement Connecticut's Criminal Justice Information System architectural standards for the Offender-Based Tracking System.

## **Delaware**

### ***Delaware Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

*Governance:* DELJIS Board of Managers

The primary governing body is the DELJIS Board of Managers. The Board establishes policy, budgets, security access, and addresses complicated issues impacting the implementation of integrated systems. Policy and Procedure: development of policy. Planning: plan events. Project Steering: review project accomplishments and provide month-to-month project steering. Executive: review personnel security issues and make determinations regarding continued access to system.

*Charter:* Delaware Annotated Code -- Title 11, Chapter 86, §8603

§ 8603. Board of Managers – Established; purpose; composition; term of office; staff; powers.

a. The Delaware Criminal Justice Information System Board of Managers, hereinafter referred to as the "Board" is hereby established.

b. The Board shall establish policy for the development, implementation and operation of comprehensive data systems in support of the agencies and courts of the criminal justice system of the State. Said data systems shall include, but not be limited to, criminal history record information with respect to individuals who are arrested, or against whom formal criminal charges are preferred within this State, or against whom proceedings relating to the adjudication of a juvenile as delinquent are instituted.

c. The Board shall be composed of 14 members, 9 of whom shall be voting members as follows:

One member of the Delaware State Police, to be designated by the Superintendent of the Delaware State Police;

One member of a county or municipal police department, to be designated by the Chairperson of the Delaware Police Chiefs' Council;

One member of the Department of Correction, to be designated by the Commissioner of Correction;

One member of the Division of Youth Rehabilitative Services, to be designated by the Director of the Division of Youth Rehabilitative Services;

Two members to be designated by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, 1 of whom shall represent the Family Court, and 1 to represent all other courts of the State;

One member of the Department of Justice, to be designated by the Attorney General;

One member of the Office of the Public Defender, to be designated by the Public Defender; and

One member-at-large to be designated by the Governor.

d. In addition, there shall be 5 nonvoting members:

Two members of the General Assembly, 1 Senator to be designated by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and 1 Representative to be designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

One member of the Delaware State Bureau of Identification, to be designated by the Superintendent of the Delaware State Police;

One member of the department (or agency) within the State with overall responsibility for providing information resource management, to be designated by the director or chief official of that agency, and

One member of the Delaware Criminal Justice Council, to be designated by the Chairperson of that Council.

e. Each Board member shall serve at the pleasure of, and for the term prescribed by, the officer or individual by whom such member was appointed.

f. The agencies represented on the Board shall provide the Board with adequate staff support to assure that applicable provisions of this chapter are effectively carried out, not inconsistent with state law.

g. The Board shall have the power and authority to:

Designate an Executive Committee which may act between meetings of the Board, subject to confirmation of its decisions by a quorum of the Board, which Executive Committee shall consist of not less than 3 members of the Board and shall be chaired by the Board Chairman.

Appoint, supervise and evaluate an Executive Director to implement and administer this chapter.

Approve the Executive Director's annual budget request and other applications for funds from any sources.

Recommend any legislation necessary for the implementation, operation and maintenance of the criminal justice information system.

Establish and implement policy for providing management and administrative statistics and for coordinating technical assistance to serve the information needs of criminal justice agencies, planners, administrators, legislators and the general public.

Perform all functions necessary to carry out the duties of this chapter. (63 Del. Laws, c. 352, § 1; 65 Del. Laws, c. 451, §§ 4-6; 68 Del. Laws, c. 103, §§ 3,4; 70 Del. Laws, c. 186, § 1.)

## **Florida**

### ***Dade County Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee (CJCC)

The Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee (CJCC) is made up of department heads from the various agencies that participate in CJIS; it has not met in a long time. In 1980, CJCC wrote an Administrative Order that created the Criminal Justice Working Group. This working group oversees system development and meets every two months. The Criminal Justice Working Group consists of mid-level management that was selected to represent the department heads. These people are, for the most part, Information Technology (IT) and operational personnel from the various agencies that participate in CJIS.

Clerk of Court	Clerk's Office
Local Courts	Courts
Local Jails	County Jail
Local Law Enforcement	Police Agencies
Probation Department	Probation Department
Prosecution	State's Attorney's Office
Public Defense	Public Defender's Office

#### *Objectives*

Converting from obsolete technology

Reducing data backlog

Reducing redundant data entry

Expanding system functionality

### ***Florida Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information System***

*Governance:* Criminal & Juvenile Justice Information System Council

Policies and Standards Work Group: developed guiding principles for the efficient and effective sharing of criminal and juvenile justice information among users and providers throughout the State. Juvenile Data Sharing Work Group: revised the Criminal Justice Data Element Dictionary, which updates a standard set of common data elements to be used statewide by all criminal and juvenile justice agencies.

Telecommunications Work Group: planning, developing and installing a statewide telecommunications network for Florida criminal and juvenile justice agencies, known as the Criminal Justice Network (CJNet).

Federal Funding Work Group: evaluates federal funding opportunities and makes recommendations to the Council regarding the most advantageous ways to use those funds for the benefit of the criminal justice community. Sentencing Forms and Process Work Group: reviews sentencing processes, associated data and forms, and recommends any appropriate changes for improving data accuracy, information sharing and reducing data redundancy.

Clerk of Court	Circuit court (one clerk of the court)
Corrections	Department of Corrections
Department of Motor Vehicles	Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles
Juvenile Justice	Department of Juvenile Justice
Local Law Enforcement	Local law enforcement (two sheriffs and two police chiefs)
Parole	Parole Commission
Prosecution	Florida Prosecuting Attorneys Association, Inc.
Prosecution	Attorney General's Office
Public Defense	Florida Public Defender Association, Inc.
State Court Administration	State Court Administrator's Office
State Law Enforcement	Department of Law Enforcement

*Charter:* State Law § 943.06

943.06 Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Systems Council. – There is created a Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Systems Council within the department.

(1) The council shall be composed of 14 members, consisting of the Attorney General or a designated assistant; the executive director of the Department of Law Enforcement or a designated assistant; the secretary of the Department of Corrections or a designated assistant; the chair of the Parole Commission or a designated assistant; the Secretary of Juvenile Justice or a designated assistant; the executive director of the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles or a designated assistant; the State Courts Administrator or a designated assistant; 1 public defender appointed by the Florida Public Defender Association, Inc.; 1 state attorney appointed by the Florida Prosecuting Attorneys Association, Inc.; and 5 members, to be appointed by the Governor, consisting of 2 sheriffs, 2 police chiefs, and 1 clerk of the circuit court.

(2) Members appointed by the Governor shall be appointed for terms of 4 years. No appointive member shall serve beyond the time he or she ceases to hold the office or employment by reason of which the member was eligible for appointment to the council. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring because of death, resignation, or ineligibility for membership shall serve only for the unexpired term of his or her predecessor or until a successor is appointed and qualifies. Any member who, without cause, fails to attend two consecutive meetings may be removed by the Governor.

(3) The council shall annually elect its chair and other officers. The council shall meet semiannually or at the call of its chair, at the request of a majority of its membership, at the request of the department, or at such times as may be prescribed by its rules. A majority of the members of the council constitutes a quorum, and action by a majority of the council shall be official.

(4) Membership on the council shall not disqualify a member from holding any other public office or being employed by a public entity except that no member of the Legislature shall serve on the council. The Legislature finds that the council serves a state, county, and municipal purpose and that service on the council is consistent with a member's principal service in a public office or employment.

(5) Members of the council shall serve without compensation, but shall be entitled to be reimbursed for per diem and travel expenses as provided by s. 112.061.

943. 081 Public safety system information technology resources; guiding principles. – The following guiding principles adopted by the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Systems Council are hereby

adopted as guiding principles for the management of public safety system information technology resources:

- (1) Cooperative planning by public safety system entities is a prerequisite for the effective development of systems to enable sharing of data.
- (2) The planning process, as well as coordination of development efforts, should include all principals from the outset.
- (3) Public safety system entities should be committed to maximizing information sharing and moving away from proprietary positions taken relative to data they capture and maintain.
- (4) Public safety system entities should maximize public access to data, while complying with legitimate security, privacy, and confidentiality requirements.
- (5) Public safety system entities should strive for electronic sharing of information via networks versus reliance on magnetic and other media.
- (6) The practice by public safety system entities of charging each other for data should, insofar as possible, be eliminated. Further, when the capture of data for mutual benefit can be accomplished, the costs for the development, capture, and network for access to that data should be shared.
- (7) The redundant data capture of data should, insofar as possible, be eliminated.
- (8) With respect to statewide databases:
  - (a) Only data that can best be compiled, preserved, and shared through a central database should be captured at the state level.
  - (b) Remote access to distributed databases should be considered and provided for, instead of central repositories.
  - (c) Statistical data that may be required infrequently or on a one-time basis should be captured via sampling or other methods.
  - (d) Only data that are auditable, or that otherwise can be determined to be accurate, valid, and reliable should be maintained.
- (9) Methods of sharing data among different protocols must be developed without requiring major redesign or replacement of individual systems.

#### *Mission*

Promote Information Sharing: To enhance public safety by providing a network which promotes cost-effective information sharing and timely and appropriate access to both local and State information for criminal justice agencies, while recognizing the independence of each agency.

#### *Objectives*

Enhance inter-agency sharing of criminal and juvenile justice information.

Reduce/eliminate redundant data entry and collection.

### ***Sarasota County Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

*Governance:* Executive Committee

Criminal Justice Information System Focus Team developed a long-range plan and financial strategy at the outset (1992). The Court Clerk heads an Executive Committee that oversees the project. The Executive Committee is comprised of agency heads from each of the represented agencies.

Clerk of Court	Court Clerk
Local Government	County Administration
Local Law Enforcement	Sheriff's Office
Prosecution	State's Attorney



*Objectives*

To provide a single integrated information system supporting all functions of the criminal justice environment in Sarasota County from the arrest function through the corrections function. The overall objective is to become a paperless environment where all activities are handled electronically.

**Illinois*****Illinois Integrated Justice Information System (IIJIS)****Governance: IIJIS Governing Board*

The Illinois IIJIS governance structure consists of the Governing Board, the Planning Committee, the Technical Committee, and the Marketing Committee. These four components focus on the following tasks: providing leadership; defining the business of justice; analyzing technical environments, policies, and solutions; and defining, articulating, and communicating the business case for integration. The IIJIS Governing Board comprises the elements of authority and the decisionmaking processes that Illinois' Governor Ryan has put in place to oversee the tasks listed above. This committee is comprised of justice agency leaders/decisionmakers and other key representatives in the integration project who represent all involved agencies and disciplines, from a variety of jurisdictional levels.

Clerk of Court	Office of the Cook County Circuit Court Clerk
Clerk of Court	Illinois Association of Court Clerks
Corrections	Illinois Department of Corrections
Crime Commission	National Insurance Crime Bureau
Criminal Justice Services	Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority
Fire Marshal	Office of the Illinois Fire Marshal
Governor's Office	Governor's Technology Office
Governor's Office	Office of the Governor
Information Technology	Cook County Bureau of Information Technology & Automation
Juvenile Justice	Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission
Local Law Enforcement	Cook County Sheriff
Local Law Enforcement	Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police
Local Law Enforcement	Illinois Sheriffs' Association
Local Courts	Illinois Conference of Chief Judges
Local Courts	Sixth Judicial Circuit Court
Local Law Enforcement	Chicago Police Department
Other	Department of Central Management Services
Other	Illinois Secretary of State
Probation Department	Illinois Probation and Court Services Association
Prosecution	Illinois State's Attorneys' Association
Prosecution	Illinois Attorney General
Prosecution	State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor
Public Defense	Office of the State Appellate Defender
State Court Administration	Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts

*Charter:* Executive Order Number 12

**EXECUTIVE ORDER CREATING THE ILLINOIS INTEGRATED JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM GOVERNING BOARD AND AN APPROACH TO INTEGRATED JUSTICE SYSTEMS IN ILLINOIS**

Whereas, the tragic deaths caused by terrorist acts on September 11, 2001, have heightened my resolve to strengthen law enforcement information and intelligence systems, and by sharing complete information throughout the entire justice system, we will give the justice community the tools it needs to better protect our citizens; and

Whereas, in January 2000, I proposed the program "ISP 2000" to focus 21st Century technology to fight crime, assess all the new technologies available and develop a plan of cooperation with local police agencies for the sharing of crime fighting technology; and

Whereas, the "Illinois Criminal Justice Information Act" created the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority "to coordinate the use of information in the criminal justice system; to promulgate effective criminal justice information policy; to encourage the improvement of criminal justice agency procedures and practices with respect to information; to provide new information technologies; to permit the evaluation of information practices and programs; to stimulate research and development of new methods and uses of criminal justice information for the improvement of the criminal justice system and the reduction of crime; and to protect the integrity of criminal history information, while protecting the citizen's right to privacy"; and

Whereas, the Illinois Department of State Police has the responsibility to maintain statewide criminal justice information systems and interfaces to other states and national criminal justice information systems that support the operational information needs of criminal justice agencies throughout Illinois including statewide and national communications networks, Law Enforcement Agencies Data System (LEADS), Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS), Criminal History Record Information (CHRI), National Crime Information Center (NCIC), and National Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (NLETS); and

Whereas, criminal justice information systems in Illinois have been designed to meet local operational needs and not to provide statewide justice information and these systems operate today as autonomous and independent systems that do not easily share information with courts or other justice agencies in a timely manner and inevitably contain much information that duplicates that gathered by other justice systems; and

Whereas, justice information in Illinois is fragmented and inconsistent and frequently not available in a timely manner to law enforcement officers or the courts for the purpose of making criminal justice decisions; and

Whereas, judges, prosecutors and police often do not know if they have complete information when making bail and sentencing decisions, charging decisions and possible plea negotiations, and arrest decisions; and

Whereas, an integrated, statewide justice information network is necessary to ensure that all public, private and individual stakeholders in the justice process have the accurate, timely, and easily accessible information they require, when and where they need it, to better administer justice and enhance the safety and well being of the people of the State of Illinois; and

Whereas, a crucial step in embarking on the process of realizing integrated justice systems in Illinois is to create a body that includes major stakeholders, both at the local and state levels, to guide the development of effective integrated systems.

THEREFORE, I, George H. Ryan, Governor of Illinois, with the intent to create an approach to integrated justice systems in this state, order the following:

**I. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ILLINOIS INTEGRATED JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM GOVERNING BOARD:**

There shall be established the Illinois Integrated Justice Information System (IIJIS) Governing Board.

## II. COMPOSITION OF THE ILLINOIS INTEGRATED JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM GOVERNING BOARD

A. The Board shall include the directors or executive level designees of the following agencies: the Department of Central Management Services, the Illinois Department of Corrections, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, the Illinois Juvenile Justice Commission, the Illinois State Police, the Office of the State Appellate Defender, and the Office of the State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor. The Board shall also include a representative from each of the following entities; the Illinois Attorney General, the Illinois Secretary of State, the Illinois Conference of Chief Judges, Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts, the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police, the Illinois Sheriffs' Association, the Illinois State's Attorneys' Association, the Illinois Association of Court Clerks, the Illinois Probation and Court Services Association, the Chicago Police Department, the Cook County Circuit Clerk, and the Cook County Sheriff. Additionally, the board shall include representatives of the Deputy Governor of Criminal Justice and Public Safety and also the Illinois Technology Office.

Additionally, the Board shall actively and continuously seek the input, assistance and participation of other departments, agencies, boards and commissions, units of government, private organizations, and public interest groups as necessary or appropriate.

B. The Executive Director of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority shall chair the IIJIS Governing Board. The Illinois State Police representative to the IIJIS Governing Board shall serve as the vice-chair.

C. The Chair shall have the authority to create ad hoc committees to assist in the completion of this order.

## III. DUTIES OF ILLINOIS INTEGRATED JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM GOVERNING BOARD

The duties of the IIJIS Governing Board shall include, but shall not necessarily be limited to the following:

A. Complete a needs assessment that will systematically identify all criminal justice systems in Illinois. All components of the Illinois justice process must be analyzed so their current and planned justice information system environment can be examined and documented.

B. Conduct a study to identify exchange points between agencies to determine where automation will enhance the integration process and automate those exchanges where participants are willing and ready for automation.

C. Develop a strategic plan for integration of Illinois justice and court information which includes, but shall not necessarily be limited to the following:

Recommending cost-effective solutions that integrate existing criminal justice information systems, providing standards for future systems development, and reducing technological incompatibility, redundancy and inefficiency.

Developing strategies to improve the positive identification of individuals who interact with the justice system through the use of enhanced biometric identification technologies such as flat fingerprints and facial recognition.

Building upon the significant financial investments already made by individual agencies on criminal justice systems, avoiding unfunded mandates on individual agencies, and identifying federal grants and other sources of funding assistance to finance the integration and improvement of justice information systems in Illinois.

Working in partnership with state and local Illinois criminal justice agencies and related social service agencies to meet their operational requirements and needs for justice-related integrated information processing while respecting their independence.

Ensuring that the privacy and civil liberties of all citizens are enhanced rather than diminished by implementation of IIJIS.

D. Report to the Governor and the General Assembly no later than December 31, 2002, on its findings, recommendations, and strategic plan.

*Mission*

The IJIS Governing Board represents justice agencies and courts spanning the full spectrum of the justice enterprise, including law enforcement, prosecution, defense, the judiciary, corrections, and relevant non-justice agencies, at local (city/county) and state levels. Our purpose is to: (1) Bring stakeholder organizations together to comprehensively and effectively plan justice information systems. (2) Coordinate information systems development activities. (3) Build and expand the range of effectiveness of information systems and sharing capabilities. (4) Improve the effectiveness, efficiency, timeliness, accuracy and completeness of information.

#### *Vision*

We envision becoming a recognized leader in justice information sharing, benefiting all citizens in Illinois and across the nation by creating a statewide information sharing capability that provides secure and timely access to accurate and complete information throughout the justice enterprise. Through integrated information sharing we will enhance the safety, security and quality of life of all citizens of Illinois; improve the quality of justice, the effectiveness of programs, and the efficiency of operations; and ensure informed decision-making, while respecting the individual's privacy and confidentiality of information.

#### *Objectives*

IJIS strategic issues, goals, objectives, outcomes and performance measures will be contained in Strategic Plan.

### ***McLean County Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS)***

*Governance:* Integrated Justice Information Systems (IJIS) Team

Clerk of Court	Circuit Clerk's Offices
Local Courts	Courts
Local Law Enforcement	Sheriff's Department
Prosecution	State's Attorney's Office
Public Defense	Public Defender's Office

*Charter:* Informal Agreement

#### *Mission*

An Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) is one that gives all the participants in the criminal and civil justice system the timely and accurate information necessary to fulfill their individual legal responsibilities. The goal of this project is to significantly improve the product quality and operational efficiency of the Justice System Office.

#### *Vision*

Original Vision Statement of May 31, 1996: Over the last two years the Justice System Offices (Sheriff, State's Attorney, Circuit Clerk, Public Defender, and Court Services, with assistance and guidance from the Director of Information Services and the County Administrator) have ambitiously and methodically pursued a SHARED VISION of a countywide Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS). The proposed integrated justice system will fundamentally improve the county's public safety and justice system, while controlling growth in staffing and space requirements. These offices annually account for approximately 62% of the county's General Fund annual operating budget. Therefore, improved efficiency in these offices will have a substantial impact on the county's operating budget. Elected and appointed county officers have demonstrated their willingness and commitment to work cooperatively to address intra-office workflow reengineering and information system issues that affect not only individual offices, but also the capability and cost of the county's entire civil and criminal justice system. As a result, McLean County has the opportunity to proactively redesign its current business processes and develop an Integrated Justice Information System of strategic value to replace its existing collection of individual manual and automated information systems. An Integrated Justice Information System (IJIS) is one that gives all the participants in the criminal and civil justice system the timely and accurate information necessary to fulfill their individual legal responsibilities.

### *Objectives*

Maximize efficiencies and minimize operating costs within the criminal justice system by:

Streamlining workflow automation within and across departments.

Improving data integrity and security.

Implementing quick and easy data sharing at local, regional, state and national levels.

Greatly reducing data entry and redundancy.

Reducing data storage and maintenance requirements.

Conforming to all state and federal reporting standards.

Providing easy interface capabilities to legacy or external systems.

Implementing flexible hardware and software configurations that are easy to maintain and expand to meet new requirements.

### ***McHenry County Integrated Justice System Project***

*Governance:* Executive Committee

Current structure includes an Executive Committee, Operational Committee, and a Technical Committee. Conceptual agreement regarding the Executive Committee was reached in 1997.

Clerk of Court	Clerk of Court
Information Services	Information Services
Jail Management	Local Jail
Juvenile Justice	Juvenile Justice
Local Court Administration	Local Court Administrator's Office
Local Courts	Local Courts
Local Law Enforcement	Local Law Enforcement
Probation Department	Probation Department
Prosecution	Local and State Prosecution
Public	Local Public Defense

*Charter:* Memorandum of Understanding

### **Iowa**

### ***Iowa Justice Information System (IJIS)***

*Governance:*

The Governance Structure is pending. At this point, a strategic planning team consisting of representatives of the Judicial Branch, Department of Corrections, Department of Public Safety, Department of Information Technology and Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning provides project guidance and direction.

### *Mission*

While recognizing and preserving the separate mission; priorities; constitutional objectives; and governing laws, rules and regulations of the participating agencies responsible for criminal justice within the State of Iowa, we will: (1) Innovatively and collaboratively work to integrate, to the most reasonable extent possible, the functionality and interoperability of criminal justice information systems. (2) Develop a governance structure that provides for the ongoing planning and oversight of integrated criminal justice information systems in Iowa. (3) Focus on enhancing the efficiency, effectiveness, and accuracy of our

criminal justice information. (4) Develop information technology architecture for an integrated criminal justice system in Iowa that makes the most appropriate use of the operational systems of participating agencies.

#### *Vision*

Work collaboratively with the Governor and his designees; the Iowa Supreme Court and staff; policymakers from federal, state, and local governments; and criminal justice agencies and associations, to develop and implement information technology solutions for the purpose of integrating the criminal justice systems from courts, law enforcement, corrections, and other governmental entities.

### **Kansas**

#### ***Kansas Criminal Justice Information System***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC)

The CJCC oversees the Kansas Criminal Justice Information System. The Council is made up of seven members (listed below). The KCJIS Advisory Board is made up of 20 members, which represent all participating state and local agencies. KCJIS Advisory Board: advises the CJCC of project progress. Standards/Technology Subcommittee: establishes standards that enable data sharing. AFIS Subcommittee: oversee procurement and management of AFIS. ASTRA Subcommittee: maintains and upgrades law enforcement's network. Juvenile Justice Subcommittee: determine IT resources needed in juvenile context. Incident-Based Reporting Subcommittee: facilitate use of Incident-Based Reporting System. Court Systems Subcommittee: supervise development of court systems. Law Enforcement System Task Force: supervise development of law enforcement systems. Prosecution System Task Force: supervise development of prosecution systems. Supervision System Task Force: oversee development of supervision systems.

Corrections	Department of Corrections
Governor's Office	Governor's Office
Juvenile Justice	Juvenile Justice Authority
Prosecution	Attorney General's Office
Social Services	Social and Rehabilitation Services
State Courts	Supreme Court
State Law Enforcement	Kansas Bureau of Investigation (KBI)

*Charter:* Article 95 K.S.A. 74-9501

Statute 74-9501

Chapter 74.-State Boards, Commissions and Authorities

Article 95.-Kansas Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

74-9501. Kansas criminal justice coordinating council; membership; powers and duties; local government advisory group; task forces. (a) There is hereby established the Kansas criminal justice coordinating council.

(b) The council shall consist of the governor or designee, the chief justice of the supreme court or designee, the attorney general or designee, the secretary of corrections, the secretary of social and rehabilitation services, the commissioner of juvenile justice and the director of the Kansas bureau of investigation.

(c) The director and all existing employees of the Kansas sentencing commission shall serve as staff to the Kansas criminal justice coordinating council, while continuing to serve at the will of the Kansas sentencing commission pursuant to K.S.A. 74-9103 and amendments thereto in the performance of its duties as outlined in K.S.A. 74-9101, 74-9106 and 21-4725 and amendments thereto. The director shall attend all meetings of the council, be responsible for keeping a record of council meetings, prepare reports of the council and perform such other duties as directed by the council.

(d) The council shall elect a chairperson and vice-chairperson from among the members of the council.

(e) The council shall:

(1) Define and analyze issues and processes in the criminal justice system, identify alternative solutions and make recommendations for improvements;

(2) perform such criminal justice studies or tasks as requested by the governor, the legislature or the chief justice, as deemed appropriate or feasible by the council;

(3) oversee development and management of a criminal justice database including assuming the designation and functions of the state statistical analysis center currently assigned to the Kansas bureau of investigation pursuant to K.S.A. 75-712a and amendments thereto. All criminal justice agencies as defined in subsection (c) of K.S.A. 22-4701 and amendments thereto and the department of social and rehabilitation services shall provide any data or information, including juvenile offender information which is requested by the council, in a form and manner established by the council, in order to facilitate the development and management of the criminal justice council database; and

(4) develop and oversee reporting of all criminal justice federal funding available to the state or local units of government including assuming the designation and functions of administering the United States bureau of justice assistance grants currently administered through the law enforcement antidrug abuse program of the department of administration. On the effective date of this act any bureau of justice assistance antidrug abuse federal fund balances in any account and all unclassified positions authorized for the law enforcement antidrug abuse program of the department of administration shall be transferred to and budgeted with the Kansas sentencing commission.

(f) The council shall appoint a standing local government advisory group to consult and advise the council concerning local government criminal justice issues and the impact of state criminal justice policy and decisions on local units of government. The advisory group shall consist of a sheriff, chief of police, county or district attorney, city governing body and a county commissioner. Appointees to such advisory group shall serve without compensation or reimbursement for travel and subsistence or any other expenses.

(g) The council shall form a task force to study the consolidation of probation, parole and community corrections services.

(h) When analyzing criminal justice issues and performing criminal justice studies, the council shall form such task groups as necessary and shall appoint individuals who appropriately represent law enforcement, the judiciary, legal profession, state, local, or federal government, the public, or other professions or groups as determined by the council, to represent the various aspects of the issue being analyzed or studied. Members of the legislature may be appointed ex officio members to such task groups. A member of the council shall serve as the chairperson of each task group appointed by the council. The council may appoint other members of the council to any task group formed by the council.

(i) The council shall review reports submitted by each task group named by the council and shall submit the report with the council's recommendations pertaining thereto to the governor, chief justice of the supreme court, the chief clerk of the house of representatives and the secretary of the senate.

### *Mission*

To create and maintain an accessible, and appropriately secured, criminal justice information repository with accurate, complete, and timely data on individuals and events for criminal justice and non-criminal justice users that supports effective administration of the criminal justice system, public and officer safety, and public policy management in a cost-effective manner within the state of Kansas.

### *Objectives*

Develop and maintain the systems necessary to ensure an accurate, timely, and comprehensive collection of criminal history information that meets local, state, and federal standards for data quality and timeliness.

Develop and maintain the system in such a way to ensure that it is compatible with the emerging national criminal justice information environment.

Increase utilization of the system by providing on-line access to the appropriate information for the

system's primary and secondary customers.

Ensure the systems' ability to migrate over time with technology advancements.

Increase cost effectiveness of the system by reducing the manpower associated with the inputs and outputs of the system at both the state and local level.

Ensure the state's ability to manage and continue to expand the functionality of the system.

Increase public safety by developing and implementing a centralized criminal justice information repository.

Maintain an information resource that seamlessly supports the operation of the criminal justice system by providing operational, statistical, and policy data to all authorized members of the criminal justice

Maintain a CJIS that respects the privacy rights of every citizen in Kansas.

## **Kentucky**

### ***Unified Criminal Justice Information System (UCJIS)***

*Governance:* Kentucky Criminal Justice Council

Funding Work Group: identifies potential funding sources and approves significant expenditures. PR Work Group: promotes UCJIS project and standards. UCJIS Subcommittee: responsible for technical solutions. Technical Work Group: responsible for technical standards and implementation. Legal Work Group: interprets current statutes, sets policy, and identifies potential issues and legislative opportunities. Warrants Work Group: works toward a cohesive definition of a warrant and how to utilize technology to expedite the process.

Clerk of Court	Frankfort County Clerk of Court
Corrections	Department of Corrections
Department of Motor Vehicles	Kentucky Department of Motor Vehicles
Information Services	Governor's Office of Technology
Jail Management	Kentucky Jailer's Association
Juvenile Justice	Department of Juvenile Justice
Juvenile Justice	Kentucky Youth Advocates
Local Courts	Circuit Judge
Local Law Enforcement	City and County Police Departments
Prosecution	Attorney General's Office
Public Defense	Department of Public Advocacy
Public Defense	Local Public Defense
State Court Administration	Kentucky Administrative Office of the Courts
State Courts	Kentucky Supreme Court
State Law Enforcement	Kentucky State Police

*Charter:* H.B. 455, 1998 Session Kentucky General Assembly

Section 27. KRS 15A.040 is amended to read as follows:

(1) The Criminal Justice Council shall advise and recommend to the Governor and the General Assembly policies and direction for long-range planning regarding all elements of the criminal justice system. The council shall review and make written recommendations on subjects including but not limited to administration of the criminal justice system, the rights of crime victims, sentencing issues, capital litigation, a comprehensive strategy to address gangs and gang problems, and the Penal Code.



Recommendations for these and all other issues shall be submitted to the Governor and the Legislative Research Commission at least six (6) months prior to every regular session of the Kentucky General Assembly. The council shall:

- (a) Make recommendations to the justice secretary with respect to the award of state and federal grants and ensure that the grants are consistent with the priorities adopted by the Governor, the General Assembly, and the council;
  - (b) Conduct comprehensive planning to promote the maximum benefits of grants;
  - (c) Develop model criminal justice programs;
  - (d) Disseminate information on criminal justice issues and crime trends;
  - (e) Work with community leaders to assess the influence of gangs and the problems that gangs cause for local communities, assist local communities in mobilizing community resources to address their problems, sponsor multidisciplinary training to help communities focus on proven strategies to address gang problems, and conduct an ongoing assessment of gang problems in local communities;
  - (f) Recommend any modifications of law necessary to insure that the laws adequately address problems identified in local communities relating to gangs;
  - (g) Provide technical assistance to all criminal justice agencies; and
  - (h) Review and evaluate proposed legislation affecting criminal justice; and
- (i) All reports and proposed legislation shall be presented to the Interim Joint Committee on Judiciary not later than July 1 of the year prior to the beginning of each regular session of the General Assembly.
- (2) Membership of the Criminal Justice Council shall consist of the following:
- (a) The secretary of the Justice Cabinet or his designee;
  - (b) The director of the Administrative Office of the Courts or his designee;
  - (c) The Attorney General or his designee;
  - (d) Two (2) members of the House of Representatives as designated by the Speaker of the House;
  - (e) Two (2) members of the Senate as designated by the President of the Senate;
  - (f) A crime victim, as defined in KRS Chapter 346, to be selected and appointed by the Governor;
  - (g) A victim advocate, as defined in KRS 421.570, to be selected and appointed by the Governor;
  - (h) A Kentucky college or university professor specializing in criminology, corrections, or a similar discipline to be selected and appointed by the Governor;
  - (i) The public advocate or his designee;
  - (j) The president of the Kentucky Sheriffs Association;
  - (k) The commissioner of state police or his designee;
  - (l) A person selected by the Kentucky State Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police;
  - (m) The president of the Kentucky Association of Chiefs of Police;
  - (n) A member of the Prosecutors Advisory Council as chosen by the council;
  - (o) The Chief Justice or a justice or judge designated by him;
  - (p) One (1) member of the Kentucky Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, appointed by the president of the organization;
  - (q) One (1) member of the Kentucky Jailer's Association appointed by the president of the organization;
  - (r) One (1) member of the Circuit Clerk's Association;
  - (s) Three (3) criminal law professors, one each from the University of Kentucky College of Law, the Louis

D. Brandeis School of Law at the University of Louisville, and the Salmon P. Chase College of Law at Northern Kentucky University, to be selected and appointed by the Governor;

(t) One (1) District Court Judge, designated by the Chief Justice;

(u) One (1) Circuit Court Judge, designated by the Chief Justice;

(v) One (1) Court of Appeals Judge, designated by the Chief Justice;

(w) One (1) representative from an organization dedicated to restorative principles of justice involving victims, the community, and offenders; and

(x) One (1) individual with a demonstrated commitment to youth advocacy, to be selected and appointed by the Governor.

(3) The secretary of justice shall serve ex officio as chairman of the council. Each member of the council shall have one (1) vote. Members of the council shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for their expenses actually and necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties.

(4) The council shall meet at least once every three (3) months.

(5) The council may hold additional meetings:

(a) On the call of the chairman;

(b) At the request of the Governor to the chairman; or

(c) At the written request of the members to the chairman, signed by a majority of the members.

(6) Two-thirds (2/3) members of the council shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business at a meeting.

(7) Failure of any member to attend two (2) meetings within a six (6) month period shall be deemed a resignation from the council and a new member shall be named by the appointing authority.

(8) The council is authorized to establish committees and appoint additional persons who may not be members of the council as necessary to effectuate its purposes, including but not limited to:

(a) Uniform Criminal Justice Information System committee;

(b) Committee on sentencing; and

(c) Penal Code committee.

The council's administrative functions shall be performed by a full-time executive director appointed by the secretary of the Justice Cabinet and supported by the administrative, clerical, and other staff as allowed by budgetary limitations and as needed to fulfill the council's role and mission and to coordinate its activities.

#### SECTION 28. A NEW SECTION OF KRS CHAPTER 17 IS CREATED TO READ AS FOLLOWS:

(1) There is hereby established the Kentucky Unified Criminal Justice Information System, referred to in this chapter as the "system." The system shall be a joint effort of the criminal justice agencies and the courts. Notwithstanding any statutes, administrative regulations, and policies to the contrary, if standards and technologies other than those set out in KRS 61.940 to 61.953 are required, the Commonwealth's chief information officer shall review, expedite, and grant appropriate exemptions to effectuate the purposes of the unified criminal justice information system. Nothing in this section shall be construed to hamper any public officer or official, agency, or organization of state or local government from furnishing information or data that they are required or requested to furnish and which they are allowed to procure by law, to the General Assembly, the Legislative Research Commission, or a committee of either. For the purposes of this section, "criminal justice agencies" include all departments of the Justice Cabinet, the Unified Prosecutorial System, Commonwealth's attorneys, county attorneys, the Transportation Cabinet, the Cabinet for Human Resources, and any agency with the authority to issue a citation or make an arrest.

(2) The program to design, implement, and maintain the system shall be under the supervision of the uniform criminal justice information system committee of the Criminal Justice Council. The membership of this committee shall be determined by the council, upon the recommendation of the Governor's chief

information officer, who shall chair the committee.

(3) The committee shall be responsible for recommending standards, policies, and other matters to the secretary of justice for promulgation of administrative regulations in accordance with KRS Chapter 13A to implement the policies, standards, and other matters relating to the system and its operation.

(4) The committee shall submit recommendations to the Criminal Justice Council and the secretary of justice for administrative regulations to implement the uniform policy required to operate the system. The committee shall implement the uniform policy.

(5) The uniform policy shall include a system to enable the criminal justice agencies and the courts to share data stored in each other's information systems. Initially, the uniform policy shall maximize the use of existing databases and platforms through the use of a virtual database created by network linking of existing databases and platforms among the various departments. The uniform policy shall also develop plans for the new open system platforms before the existing platforms become obsolete.

(6) The committee shall be responsible for recommending to the Criminal Justice Council and the secretary of justice any necessary changes in administrative regulations necessary to implement the system. The committee shall also recommend to the Criminal Justice Council, the Chief Justice, and the secretary of justice recommendations for statutory additions or changes necessary to implement and maintain the system. The secretary shall be responsible for reporting approved statutory recommendations to the Governor, the Chief Justice, the Legislative Research Commission, and appropriate committees of the General Assembly.

(7) The chair of the committee shall report annually to the Criminal Justice Council on the status of the system.

(8) All criminal justice agencies shall follow the policies established by administrative regulation for the exchange of data and connection to the system.

(9) The committee shall review how changes to existing criminal justice agency applications impact the new integrated network. Changes to criminal justice agency applications that have an impact on the integrated network shall be coordinated through and approved by the committee.

(10) Any future state-funded expenditures by a criminal justice agency for computer platforms in support of criminal justice applications shall be reviewed by the committee.

(11) Any criminal justice agency or officer that does not participate in the criminal justice information system may be denied access to state and federal grant funds.

### *Mission*

The mission of the Unified Criminal Justice Information System is to provide for the collection and availability of accurate up-to-date information relating to individuals charged with or convicted of a criminal offense in a timely and easily accessible manner to the criminal justice community while maintaining appropriate security and privacy standards.

### *Vision*

UCJIS is an information system that utilizes technology to capture electronically at the earliest opportunity data built on a set of unique identifiers (charge and individual). This data will appear as a seamless record of an individual's encounters with the Criminal Justice System.

### *Objectives*

Reducing or eliminating redundant data entry.

Automating citation information and jail bookings.

Capturing information at the point of transaction.

Documenting images (such as mug shots, scars/marks/tattoos, fingerprints).

Developing complete and summarized profiles of individual offenders (including aliases, SSN, friends/associates).

Allowing common information to be shared rapidly and accurately.

Streamlining courtroom planning.

Keeping dockets current.

Sharing common information, while protecting privileged data.

Systems will be expandable horizontally, across state agencies, as well as vertically, from state to local agencies and vice versa, giving appropriate access to as much information as possible (within separation of powers).

Conforming to national standards, not only now but as the standards evolve.

Incorporating new technologies as they become available. This should become a relatively minor project, since data will be under a single logical system, instead of the multiple systems now in use.

## **Maryland**

### ***Maryland Integrated Inter-Agency Justice Information Systems (MIIJIS)***

*Governance:* The Criminal Justice Information Advisory Board

The Criminal Justice Information Advisory Board was established in 1976 by State legislation (Annotated Code of Maryland, Article 27, Section(s) 742-755). The primary duty of the Board is to advise the Secretary of DPSCS and the Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals on matters pertaining to the development, operation, and maintenance of the criminal justice information system. The Board is also responsible for monitoring the operation of the system. To accomplish its mission, the Board performs tasks such as: (1) proposes to the Secretary of DPSCS and Chief Judge any rule or regulations necessary for the development, operation and maintenance of the system; (2) recommends procedures for the use of criminal history records information for research, evaluation, and statistical purposes; (3) recommends any legislation required for the implementation, operation, and maintenance of the system; and (4) reports annually to the Governor and General Assembly on the development and operation of the system. In July 1999, Lieutenant Governor Kathleen Kennedy Townsend established a statewide Task Force on Public Safety Technology for Maryland. To ensure the effectiveness of the Task Force in addressing the broad range of complex issues facing it, Ms. Townsend appointed three co-chairs to share leadership: Stuart O. Simms, Secretary of Maryland Public Safety and Correctional Services; Colonel David B. Mitchell, Secretary of the Maryland State Police; and T. Eloise Foster, Secretary of Maryland Department of Budget and Management. The Task Force has published two significant reports since its inception: (1) State of Maryland Public Safety Technology Needs Assessment, September 29, 2000; and (2) A Framework for Upgrading Technology and Justice Integration, Spring 2002. These reports will serve as the statewide guidance for implementing justice integration efforts in Maryland.

DPSCS Information Technology Steering Committee: priority and funding allocation decisions are made within this committee. The priority for support and rollout of the eGov projects for the Department are determined here. Support Services Focus Work Group: this group is assisting in the development of Service Level Agreements. This group plays an active role in maintaining current planning and implementation efforts for ITCD. Criminal Justice Information Advisory Board (CJIAB): this board has established the following working groups: (1) Technology, (2) Telecommunications, (3) Policy and Standards, (4) Records Assessment and (5) Security and Access. Architecture Committee: all projects approved for action by the IT Steering Committee must first be funneled through this group to ensure that the technology architecture is maintained. ITCD Senior Managers: the Senior Managers of ITCD are charged with the collection and preparation of the content in the ITMP planning document. Telecommunications: creates baseline of current services; document and recommend standards for statewide adoption by criminal justice community; provide a forum for exchange of information and for pilot initiatives. Policy and Integration Standards: recommends policy/standards concerning cross-jurisdictional/functional issues: e.g., fingerprinting; data exchange; warrants; XML; etc. Includes review of federal/states' policies and standards. Technology: provides recommendations for the establishment of standards and policies governing architecture, middleware, etc, in support of cross-functional integration. Records Assessment: provides advice and recommendations on the Criminal Justice Record Improvement Plan and update; standardized RAP Sheet; expungement issues; responses to FBI audit of III compliance;

etc. Security and Access: advises on security and access.

Financial Office	Office of Management and Budget
Financial Office	Department of Fiscal Services
Legislature	Maryland House of Delegates
Legislature	Maryland State Senate
Other	Westminster City Council (Carroll County)
Other	PSAP Director
Other	Office of Legislative Auditors
Public	Private Citizens
State Law Enforcement	Department of Maryland State Police

*Charter:* Annotated Code of Maryland, Article 27, Sections 742-755

#### *Mission*

The mission for the Maryland Integrated Inter-Agency Justice Information System (MIJIS) simply stated is to put the right information in the right hands at the right time. Sharing information across the various criminal justice entities that is timely, secure, accurate, comprehensive and reliable concerning offenders statewide to all criminal justice agencies and to individual decision-makers will afford quality justice and law enforcement decision-making and thus serve to enhance public safety throughout the State of Maryland.

#### *Vision*

The vision is to develop and implement an integrated criminal justice information system that will share critical data, documents, images and key transactions at key decision points throughout the justice enterprise without regard to time and location. This effort will support and substantially improve the consistency and reliability of information provided to key decision-makers affording effective decision making, tracking of offenders, statistical reporting, and thus, ensuring the safety of the public and its officers/agents. The exchange of information should contain accurate, complete and timely data on individuals and events. This information should be exchanged in an easily accessible way for both the criminal justice user(s) as well as the non-criminal justice users, as appropriate, while maintaining an appropriately secured criminal justice information system. Interoperability processes will be used to define an environment in which computer programs can share and exchange data automatically (without translation or human intervention), regardless of the type of software or of where the data may be residing. An additional by-product may be to reduce the overall cost of operations. Sharing of crucial data enables: Better quality of information; Better quality of decisions; Better statistical analysis of data (reporting); Improves timely access to information; Consistency, accuracy and reliability improved; Immediate access; Reduced redundant data entry; Improves quality of justice (intangible); Opportunity to re-engineer – can identify significant duplication in data entry (redundant process and circuitous business processes); Legislative requirements frequently spawn funding programs to support state and local jurisdictions in the development of systems, or the resources for these efforts.

#### *Objectives*

Agencies must be able to access and share critical information.

Public Safety and Transportation Communities must communicate.

Statewide infrastructure network is needed to enable public safety.

All efforts in Maryland should establish and support fundamental goals to be effective: (a) Timely and accurate collection of relevant information, with clear responsibility and accountability defined; (b) Rapid and easy access to needed information to increase community safety and four-pronged crime control and prevention strategy; (c) Convenient and immediate public access to appropriate criminal justice information; and (d) Establish effective means of communication for managing incidents, linking public

safety and first responder personnel with each other, with other agencies within the State and in surrounding states, and with federal emergency assistance organizations.

## **Michigan**

### ***Berrien County Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

*Governance:* Informal structure

Representatives from the criminal justice agencies meet bi-weekly to discuss integrated systems issues.

Local Courts	Trial Court (District, Circuit, Probate and Family)
Local Law Enforcement	Sheriff's Department
Probation Department	Felony and Misdemeanor Probation Departments
Prosecution	Prosecutor's Office

#### *Objectives*

Increase level and timeliness of information sharing among Berrien County criminal justice agencies.

Eliminate redundant data entry.

Standardize equipment.

Facilitate coordinated financial management and planning with county and state.

Meet Michigan data standards.

### ***Michigan Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) Policy Council

Operational and Technical: review the operational procedures and technical matters of LEIN & AFIS to ensure optimum system effectiveness. Administration: review and revise administrative rules, policies, laws and legislation impacting CJIS. Security and Privacy: review reported violations, actions taken by departments to reprimand violators, and actions taken to prevent future violations and make recommendations to the CJIS Policy Council. Integration: review and make recommendations on all issues relating to the rapid exchange of accurate information between criminal justice agencies.

Corrections	Department of Corrections
Department of Motor Vehicles	Department of Motor Vehicles
Jail Management	Michigan Sheriff's Association (4 representatives)
Local Law Enforcement	Michigan Chiefs of Police (4 representatives)
Other	Private Security representatives
Prosecution	Prosecutor's Association (3 representatives)
Prosecution	Attorney General's Office
Social Services	Family Independence Agency
State Court Administration	State Court Administrator's Office
State Courts	Circuit Court Judge
State Courts	District Court Judge
State Law Enforcement	Michigan State Police (4 representatives)

*Charter:* Executive Order No. 1998-1

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF STATE POLICE L.E.I.N. POLICY COUNCIL A.F.I.S. POLICY COUNCIL CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

WHEREAS, Article V, Section 2, of the Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963 empowers the Governor to make changes in the organization of the Executive Branch or in the assignment of functions among its units which he considers necessary for efficient administration; and

WHEREAS, the Law Enforcement Information Network (L.E.I.N.) Policy Council was established pursuant to Act No. 163 of the Public Acts of 1974 to create policy and promulgate rules regarding the operational procedures to be followed by agencies using the law enforcement information network, to review applications for network terminals and approve or disapprove the applications and the sites for terminal installations and to establish minimum standards for terminal sites and installations; and

WHEREAS, the Automated Fingerprint Identification System (A.F.I.S.) Policy Council was established pursuant to Act No. 307 of the Public Acts of 1988 to, among other things, create policy and promulgate rules regarding the operation and audit procedures to be followed by agencies using the A.F.I.S., to design and provide for statewide identification of individuals using an A.F.I.S., to establish minimum standards for A.F.I.S. sites and installation, to review proposed applications for the A.F.I.S. and approve or disapprove the applications and the sites for system installations and to establish policy and promulgate rules restricting the dissemination of identification information to individuals and agencies; and

WHEREAS, the membership of the L.E.I.N. Policy Council is fully represented on the A.F.I.S. Policy Council; and

WHEREAS, the mission and goals of the L.E.I.N. Policy Council and the A.F.I.S. Policy Council are similar and the technologies and system interaction involved with both L.E.I.N. and A.F.I.S. are closely linked; and

WHEREAS, the functions, duties and responsibilities assigned to the L.E.I.N. Policy Council and the A.F.I.S. Policy Council can be more effectively organized and carried out under the supervision and direction of one governmental body; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary in the interests of efficient administration and effectiveness of government to effect changes in the organization of the Executive Branch of government.

NOW, THEREFORE, I, John Engler, Governor of the State of Michigan, pursuant to the powers vested in me by the Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963 and the laws of the State of Michigan, do hereby order the following:

1. There is created the Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) Policy Council within the Department of State Police. The council shall exercise its prescribed powers, duties, functions and responsibilities independently of the director of the department. The budgeting, procurement and related management functions of the council shall be performed under the direction and supervision of the director of the department.
2. The CJIS Policy Council shall consist of the following members:
  - a. The Attorney General or his or her designee;
  - b. The Secretary of State or his or her designee;
  - c. The Director of the Department of State Police or his or her designee;
  - d. The Director of the Department of Corrections or his or her designee;
  - e. Three representatives of the Department of State Police to be appointed by the Director of the Department of State Police;
  - f. The Chief of Detroit Police Department or his or her designee;
  - g. Three representatives of the Michigan Association of Chiefs of Police to be appointed by that association;
  - h. Four representatives of the Michigan Sheriff's Association to be appointed by that association;
  - i. Three representatives of the Prosecuting Attorneys Association of Michigan to be appointed by that association;

- j. A representative of the Michigan District Judges Association to be appointed by that association;
  - k. A representative of the Michigan Judges Association to be appointed by that association;
  - l. The State Court Administrator or his or her designee;
  - m. An individual employed in or engaged in the business of private security, who shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Governor;
  - n. An individual who represents human services concerns in the state, who shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Governor; and
  - o. The executive secretary of the CJIS Policy Council, who shall serve in an ex officio capacity.
3. The Council shall, at its first meeting, elect from its membership a chairperson who shall serve for one year. Elections thereafter shall be held annually. A chairperson may, if reelected, succeed himself or herself. The council shall meet quarterly, during the months of January, April, July and October, and at other times the chairperson considers necessary. A majority of the council members shall constitute a quorum for conducting the business of the council.
4. The council chairperson shall appoint committee chairpersons with the approval of the council. A committee chairperson may succeed himself or herself if reappointed.
5. Council members or their representatives shall serve without compensation, but shall be entitled to actual expenses incurred during attendance at a regular or special council meeting and in traveling to and from a meeting.
6. A council member shall serve a two (2) year term and may succeed himself or herself if reappointed as a member.
7. All the statutory authority, powers, duties, functions and responsibilities, including the functions of rulemaking, budgeting, procurement and related management functions of the A.F.I.S. Policy Council set forth in Act No. 307 of the Public Acts of 1988, as amended, being Sections 28.151 et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws, are hereby transferred to the CJIS Policy Council by a Type III transfer, as defined by Section 3 of Act No. 380 of the Public Acts of 1965, as amended, being Section 16.103 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, and the A.F.I.S. Policy Council is abolished.
8. In addition to the aforementioned responsibilities, the CJIS Policy Council shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Director of the Department of State Police on issues related to the development and deployment of information management systems that facilitate the rapid exchange of accurate information between the various components of the criminal justice community.
9. All the statutory authority, powers, duties, functions and responsibilities, including the functions of rulemaking, budgeting, procurement and related management functions of the L.E.I.N. Policy Council set forth in Act No. 163 of the Public Acts of 1974, as amended, being Sections 28.211 et seq. of the Michigan Compiled Laws, are hereby transferred to the CJIS Policy Council by a Type III transfer, as defined by Section 3 of Act No. 380 of the Public Acts of 1965, as amended, being Section 16.103 of the Michigan Compiled Laws, and the L.E.I.N. Policy Council is abolished.
10. The Director of the Department of State Police shall provide executive direction and supervision for the implementation of the transfers and shall make internal organizational changes that may be administratively necessary to complete the realignment of responsibilities prescribed by this Order.
11. All records, personnel, property and unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations and other funds used, held, employed, available or to be made available to the A.F.I.S. Policy Council or the L.E.I.N. Policy Council are hereby transferred to the CJIS Policy Council.
12. The Department of Management and Budget shall determine and authorize the most efficient manner possible for handling financial transactions and records in the state's financial management system for the remainder of this fiscal year.
13. All rules, orders, contracts and agreements relating to the assigned functions lawfully adopted prior to the effective date of this Order shall continue to be effective until revised, amended or repealed.



14. Any suit, action or other proceeding lawfully commenced by, against or before any entity affected by this Order shall not abate by reason of the taking effect of this Order. Any suit, action or other proceeding may be maintained by, against or before the appropriate successor of any entity affected by this Order.

In fulfillment of the requirement of Article V, Section 2, of the Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963, the provisions of this Order shall become effective sixty (60) days after filing.

Given under my hand and the Great Seal of the State of Michigan this 10th day of February, in the Year of our Lord, One Thousand Nine Hundred Ninety-Eight.

#### *Mission*

Create and maintain an accessible and appropriately secured, information system on individuals and events for criminal justice and public safety users that supports effective administration of the justice system, public and officer safety, and public policy decisions in a cost effective manner within the state of Michigan.

#### *Objectives*

Every Michigan public safety agency shall be able to determine the Michigan correctional status (i.e., incarceration in a state correctional facility, local jail or holding facility, on probation or parole, and the terms and conditions of parole and probation, under community supervision, or some other form of correctional supervision and/or release) within 2 minutes with status currency of 24 hours.

Every Michigan public safety agency shall be able to obtain a record through an inquiry by name and date of birth, of a person who has one, within 1 minute and to the officer within 2 minutes, with history currency of 24 hours. The records received should include all those records available in the current LEIN, Criminal History, SOS, NLETS, NCIC and III files.

Every public safety agency with a live scan terminal connected to the state shall receive positive fingerprint identification within 2 hours of the submission.

Every law enforcement agency shall be able to forward to the appropriate criminal justice agency a warrant request for electronic review, approval and entry into the LEIN system.

Every public safety agency should be able to determine pre-adjudication information including pending charges, bail and bond release, and conditions within 24 hours accuracy.

Every public safety agency should be able to determine non-criminal case information within a 24 hour currency (i.e., PPO status, civil warrants, divorce case information, diversion status). This should be accomplished through a web browser front-end which would identify a broad range of records and their availability. The records returned should have hotlinks to other available datasets both in centrally held database and in other contributing databases. These databases may be other public safety agencies or others.

Every public safety agency should have the capability to download records from all centrally held databases with security established according to legal capabilities. Reporting and analysis capability down to the ORI level with security to provide the potential for ad-hoc reporting.

Every public safety agency shall have access to a newly created, centrally held image repository. This repository shall maintain mugshots, palm prints and images of scars, marks and tattoos. This information shall be returned to a search request as a supplement to the CHRIS.

Each public safety agency shall have the general ability as an authorized subscriber to information regarding a broad range of actions taken associated with specific people, cases and addresses. These include: (1) The ability to subscribe to activity on registered records, (2) The ability to subscribe to additional activity on investigation systems (STATIS) and inquiries. (3) Electronic notification of justice agency actions. (4) Notification of court actions, prosecutor actions, etc.

Each public safety agency shall have a minimum capability to capture and submit electronic records to the state repository.

The CJIS policy council or designee will agree upon standards, which must be followed while using the integrated data system. Those standards will include: (1) Data standards, (2) Operational standards, and

(3) Security standards.

Every public safety agency will have available to them all centrally held databases a minimum of 99% of the time.

### ***Saginaw County Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

#### *Governance:*

A steering committee oversees system development and modifications (no formal name). In addition, a working group deals with technical issues.

Local Court Administration	Court Administrator's Office for Circuit and District Court
Local Courts	Circuit and District Courts
Prosecution	Prosecutor's Office

*Charter:* Informal Agreement

#### *Objectives*

Eliminate redundant data entry.

Increase clerical staff efficiency.

## **Minnesota**

### ***The Minnesota Approach to Integration: An Enterprise Information Architecture***

*Governance:* Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group

In 1992, the Minnesota Legislature formed an oversight body titled the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group (hereinafter, the "Policy Group"). Four Policy Group members were named to carry out and oversee statewide criminal justice information issues and integration efforts: the chair of the sentencing guidelines commission, the commissioner of corrections, the commissioner of public safety, and the state court administrator. In addition, the Minnesota Legislature identified a Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Task Force (hereinafter, the "Task Force"), made up of criminal justice practitioners from throughout the state, to provide input and recommendations to the Policy Group. To help it carry out its responsibilities and monitor efforts at a detailed level, the Policy Group identified a working group of operational managers from within the four Policy Group agencies, titled the Data Group.

Since that time, the Policy Group, the Task Force, and the Data Group have worked together to address a variety of integration problems; made collaborative requests to the Minnesota legislature for funding, completed many cross-agency projects; and developed a strategic approach for criminal justice system integration and processes to support integration efforts at all levels.

At the direction of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Information Policy Group, the Data Group has managed a heavy load of cross-agency criminal justice projects since 1992. The operational managers within the Data Group meet weekly to discuss project status and future direction.

## **Missouri**

### ***Missouri's Integrated Justice Information System***

*Governance:* Missouri Criminal Records Advisory Committee

The governance of the statewide integration efforts is provided through the Missouri Criminal Records Advisory Committee. This Committee is established by Missouri statute and is chaired by the Director of the Department of Public Safety. The Committee is comprised of high-level officials from within the State and their appointment is either set out in statute or by the Director of the Department of Public Safety. The Committee meets annually and provides direction to agencies contributing to the Missouri Central Records Repository and acts upon policy recommendations that affect the operation of the Missouri criminal justice information system. The Advisory Committee has also named a sub-committee to administer grant funds distributed to Missouri that contribute to the improvement of criminal history records. The sub-committee

is charged with developing grant applications and administering the resulting awards in a manner that is supportive of Missouri's integration efforts in the criminal justice environment. The sub-committee has responsibility for the National Criminal History Improvement Program, the Byrne 5% Set Aside Program and other grant programs that become available and will contribute to the improvement of the criminal justice information system and the State's integration efforts.

Clerk of Court	County Court Clerks
Corrections	Missouri Department of Corrections/Prison, Probation & Parole
Local Courts	Chairman of Circuit Courts Budget Committee
Local Law Enforcement	Police Chiefs from Jurisdictions over 200,000 in Population
Local Law Enforcement	Missouri Sheriff's Association
Local Law Enforcement	Missouri Police Officers Association
Local Law Enforcement	Missouri Police Chiefs Association
Other	Up to Three Appointments from Other Criminal Justice Agencies
Prosecution	Missouri Association of Prosecuting Attorneys
Prosecution	Missouri Office of Prosecution Services
Public Safety	Department of Public Safety (Director's Office)
State Court Administration	Office of State Courts Administrator
State Courts	Chairman of State Judicial Records Committee
State Courts	Chief Clerk of Missouri Supreme Court
State Law Enforcement	Missouri State Highway Patrol

*Charter:* Missouri Revised Statutes §43.518

Criminal records advisory committee, established – purpose – members – meetings, quorum – minutes, distribution, filing of.

43.518. 1. There is hereby established within the department of public safety a "Criminal Records Advisory Committee" whose purpose is to recommend general policies with respect to the philosophy, concept and operational principles of the Missouri criminal history record information system established by sections 43.500 to 43.530, in regard to the collection, processing, storage, dissemination and use of criminal history record information maintained by the central repository.

2. The committee shall be composed of the following officials or their designees: the director of the department of public safety; the director of the department of corrections and human resources; the attorney general; the director of the Missouri office of prosecution services; the president of the Missouri prosecutors association; the president of the Missouri court clerks association; the chief clerk of the Missouri state supreme court; the director of the state courts administrator; the chairman of the state judicial record committee; the chairman of the circuit court budget committee; the presidents of the Missouri peace officers association; the Missouri sheriffs association; the Missouri police chiefs association or their successor agency; the superintendent of the Missouri highway patrol; the chiefs of police of agencies in jurisdictions with over two hundred thousand population; except that, in any county of the first class having a charter form of government, the chief executive of the county may designate another person in place of the police chief of any countywide police force, to serve on the committee; and, at the discretion of the director of public safety, as many as three other representatives of other criminal justice records systems or law enforcement agencies may be appointed by the director of public safety. The director of the department of public safety will serve as the permanent chairman of this committee.

3. The committee shall meet as determined by the director but not less than semiannually to perform its duties. A majority of the appointed members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

4. No member of the committee shall receive any state compensation for the performance of duties

associated with membership on this committee.

5. Official minutes of all committee meetings will be prepared by the director, promptly distributed to all committee members, and filed by the director for a period of at least five years.

## **Montana**

### ***Montana Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

*Governance:* Executive Committee and Criminal Justice Information Services Project Advisory Group

The Executive Committee oversees the Criminal Justice Information Services Project Advisory Group. The Governor, Attorney General, and Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court are the sole members of the Executive Committee. A Memorandum of Understanding established both the Executive Committee and the Criminal Justice Information Services Project Advisory Group. Subcommittees: Policy, Data and Business Standards, Technical Support, and CJIS Management Team.

*Charter:* Memorandum of Understanding

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into between the Office of the Governor, the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Montana Supreme Court.

#### **I. PURPOSE**

The purpose of this MOU is to assist the Montana Criminal Justice Information System (MCJIS) in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of information services available to state and local justice and law enforcement agencies by creating and participating in an Executive Committee and a Criminal Justice Information Services (CJIS) Advisory Group. These groups will integrate the services of Montana's criminal justice agencies, increase interagency coordination, and maximize the use of all agency resources.

#### **II. ORGANIZATION**

A. Executive Committee - The Governor, the Attorney General and the Chief Justice of the Montana Supreme Court shall comprise the "Executive Committee", as they represent entities of the state with a vested interest in the criminal justice system and have the authority to dedicate resources to further the goals and mission of the Montana Criminal Justice Information System (MCJIS).

B. CJIS Advisory Group - Representatives of the following agencies will comprise the "CJIS Advisory Group":

- Governor's Office
- Department of Justice
- Montana Board of Crime Control
- Department of Corrections
- Court Administrator
- Department of Public Health and Human Services
- Department of Administration, Information Services Division
- District Court Judge
- Clerk of Court (District Court)
- Commission on Courts of Limited Jurisdiction
- Clerk of Court (Limited Jurisdiction Court)
- Juvenile Probation Officers
- Montana Sheriffs and Peace Officers Association
- Montana Association of Chiefs of Police

- County Attorneys
- Montana Association of Counties
- League of Cities and Towns
- Board of Parole
- Montana Dept. of Transportation
- Montana Senate
- Montana House of Representatives
- Montana Tribal Representative

C. CJIS Advisory Group Subcommittees - The CJIS Advisory Group will establish subcommittees to develop plans and recommendations on policy, operation, and technical needs. Membership in the subcommittees is not limited to CJIS Advisory Group members, but will include subject experts in related fields that are recruited to assist in the preparation of work products.

### III. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee is responsible for the following actions:

- (1) Determining the resources to be made available to further the purposes of this MOU;
- (2) The final adoption or disapproval of the CJIS Advisory Group's recommendations;

### IV. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CJIS ADVISORY GROUP

The CJIS Advisory Group is responsible for the following actions:

- (1) Advising and making recommendations to the Executive Committee on policy issues, technical issues, and any other issues necessary for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of information services available to state and local justice and law enforcement agencies.
- (2) Continually reviewing and recommending changes to the organizational structure created by this MOU to ensure the long term success of CJIS coordination;
- (3) Continually reviewing and recommending any changes in governance, state policies or legislation needed to meet and sustain the goal of long term CJIS coordination.

### V. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CJIS ADVISORY GROUP'S SUBCOMMITTEES

#### SUBCOMMITTEES

The CJIS Advisory Group's subcommittees are responsible for:

- (1) Developing plans and recommendations on policy;
- (2) Developing plans and recommendations on operations
- (3) Developing plans and recommendations on technical needs;

### VI. JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND CJIS ADVISORY GROUP

The Executive Committee and the CJIS Advisory Group shall work jointly with the Board of Crime Control to determine what future grants and other funding alternatives will:

- (1) maximize the use of all available resources;
- (2) meet the needs of the entire criminal justice community; and
- (3) avoid duplication of the efforts of the various criminal justice agencies.

### VII. FINANCING

The parties to this MOU shall be responsible for any expenses they incur in carrying out the objectives of this agreement. However, the DOJ will provide funding for up to four CJIS Advisory Group meetings per

year.

#### VIII. EFFECTIVE DATE AND TERMINATION

This MOU shall be effective January 8, 2001, through December 31, 2003. All of this agreement, or any designated services covered by this agreement, may be terminated by any party at any time, with or without cause, upon no less than thirty (30) days written notice.

#### IX. RENEWAL

This MOU may be renewed for additional two-year periods upon the mutual consent of the Governor's Office, the Department of Justice and the Montana Supreme Court.

#### X. MODIFICATION OF MOU

This MOU may not be modified, except in writing signed by the representative of each party.

#### XI. LIAISONS

The following persons shall serve as their agency's liaison for purposes of this MOU:

1. Office of the Governor: Jean Branscum
2. Department of Justice: Wilbur W. Rehmann
3. Montana Supreme Court: Lisa Smith

#### *Mission*

The Montana Criminal Justice Information Systems Advisory Group seeks to develop and maintain a criminal justice information system that: (1) Protects the privacy of citizens. (2) Maintains the security of the information. (3) Allows for cost-effective information sharing among law enforcement agencies, courts and other governmental entities and the public as provided by law. (4) Avoids unnecessary duplication. The advisory group also seeks to promote partnerships among courts, federal, state and local criminal and non-criminal justice agencies, while recognizing the independence of each.

#### *Objectives*

Every MT criminal justice agency shall be able to determine the MT correctional status (incarcerated, on parole, on probation, under community services or correctional supervision) within two minutes, with status currency of 24 hours.

Every MT criminal justice agency shall be able to obtain the MT criminal history record of a person who has one, within 4 minutes, with history currency of 24 hours.

Operational goals: Positive identification; generate and provide access to warrants; determine pre-trial status statewide; investigative information/pointer system that will assist intelligence sharing; automatic or subscription notification; case history and status, including charges and dispositions; corrections and state supervision status; digital mug shots with web access; and management, administrative -- including email, GIS and analysis capabilities.

#### **Nebraska**

#### ***Nebraska Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Information Systems Advisory Committee, NE Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice

The Director of the Crime Commission's Statistical Analysis Center provides primary staff support for Committee activities and serves as chairperson of the CJIS Committee. Representatives of the Nebraska Department of Education, Department of Roads and Department of Motor Vehicles, as well as representatives from the Legislature and Legislative Fiscal Office, have actively participated in CJIS Committee meetings.

Clerk of Court

Clerks of the District Court Employees

Corrections	Nebraska Department of Correctional Services
Crime Commission	Nebraska Crime Commission
Criminal Defense	Nebraska Criminal Defense Attorneys' Association
Data Processing	Nebraska Interagency Data Communications Advisory Council
Domestic Violence Assistance	Nebraska Domestic Violence / Sexual Assault Coalition
Juvenile Justice	Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Juvenile Services
Local Courts	Nebraska Association of County Courts
Local Government	Nebraska Association of County Officials
Local Government	League of Nebraska Municipalities
Local Jails	County-level detention departments
Local Law Enforcement	Lincoln Police Department
Local Law Enforcement	Omaha Police Department
Local Law Enforcement	Nebraska Sheriff's Association
Local Law Enforcement	Police Chiefs' Association of Nebraska
Local Law Enforcement	Police Officers' Association of Nebraska
Parole	Nebraska Parole Board
Probation Department	Nebraska Probation Administration
Prosecution	Nebraska County Attorneys' Association
Prosecution	Nebraska Attorney General's Office
Public Advocacy	Nebraska Commission on Public Advocacy
State Court Administration	State Court Administrator's Office
State Law Enforcement	Nebraska State Patrol
Victim Assistance	Nebraska Coalition for Victims of Crime

### *Mission*

Create and maintain a Nebraska criminal justice information system for authorized state and local criminal justice and non-criminal justice users that supports operations, policy analysis, and public safety and that is accurate, timely, complete, appropriately secured to protect privacy rights, cost-effective, and accessible.

### *Vision*

Provide access to data as well as efficiency in the use or sharing of data for State and local users throughout the criminal justice system. This will include electronic transfer of information across agencies and jurisdictions.

### *Objectives*

Increase user access.

Improve data quality.

Improve data completeness.

Maximize system efficiency.

Ensure privacy rights by maintaining necessary security.

## **Nevada**

### ***Nevada Criminal Justice Information System (NCJIS)***

*Governance:* Nevada Criminal Justice Information System (NCJIS) Advisory Committee

NCJIS Advisory Committee and the Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety oversee development of the redesigned criminal justice information system. The Advisory Committee was established through an informal process (not established by legislation) between representatives of the Northern and Southern committee members, which consist of individuals from various criminal justice agencies such as, police departments, sheriff's offices, district attorneys, parole and probation, criminal history records repository and court personnel.

Corrections	Department of Prisons
Department of Motor Vehicles	Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety
Local Courts	State Judge's Association
Local Law Enforcement	Northern, southern and rural law enforcement agencies
Probation/Parole	Nevada Division of Parole and Probation
Prosecution	District Attorney's Association
State Court Administration	Administrative Office of the Courts (State Supreme Court)
State Law Enforcement	Nevada Division of Investigation
State Law Enforcement	Nevada Highway Patrol

*Charter:* Informal Process

#### *Mission*

The mission of the Records and Identification Services Bureau is to provide Nevada law enforcement, criminal justice agencies, and many other federal, state, and local agencies with centralized, complete and documented information for use in making informed criminal justice decisions. In addition, the Bureau assists Nevada's private sector in matters pertaining to licensing, employment background checks, and instant firearm eligibility checks.

#### *Objectives*

- Addition of a parole and probation component.
- Creation of a sex offender registration utility.
- Creation of a temporary protection and extended protective order utility.
- Rewrite of the current database.
- Addition of a prison component.
- Creation of a convicted person registration utility.
- Creation of a child abuse utility.
- Creation of a warrant/criminal history interface.
- Addition of a non-fingerprint history interface.
- Creation of a civil (work card) file.
- Creation of a vehicle (tow/repossession) file.
- Creation of a carry concealed weapon (CCW Permit) file.
- Addition of gun denial (Brady) file.
- Creation of a juvenile offender file.



Creation of an Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) reporting mechanism

Participation in the National Fingerprint File (NFF).

Development of a State ORI (Originating Agency ID#) mechanism to allow civil users access to the system for conviction only data.

Creation of a no charges field utility.

Creation of a wrong subject booked utility.

Conversion of old system records to the new database layout.

## **New Jersey**

### ***New Jersey Criminal Justice Information System***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Information Systems (CJIS) Policy Board

CJIS is an inter-agency criminal justice planning committee established in 1990 to improve and facilitate the exchange of information and data between the various components of New Jersey's Criminal Justice System. The Policy Board meets on a monthly basis to coordinate and direct criminal justice MIS development and to review the status of a multitude of inter-agency MIS projects supported through various federally funded grants.

Corrections	Department of Corrections
Criminal Justice Services	Division of Criminal Justice
Information Technology	Office of Information Technology (OIT)
Jail Management	NJ Jail Wardens Association
Juvenile Justice	Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC)
Prosecution	Attorney General's Office
State Court Administration	Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC)
State Law Enforcement	NJ Division of State Police
Victim Assistance	Victims of Crime Compensation Board (VCCB)

*Charter:* Cooperative effort (not established by legislation)

#### *Objectives*

Address the state's MIS interagency information exchange problems, such as: - Hardware/software incompatibility between systems; - Unique identifiers not available in all criminal justice agency systems; - Original ten-print fingerprint arrest cards not received on 30% of all arrested persons; - Lack of electronic transfer software; and - Data dictionary/definition problems.

## **New Mexico**

### ***New Mexico Justice Information Sharing Project (JISP)***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Information Management Team (CJIMT)

The Justice Information Sharing Project is under the direction of the Criminal Justice Information Management Team (CJIMT) which is, in turn, under the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council. The six participating departments entered into senior executive level agreements among their Secretaries and Directors. The CJIMT was established as a sub-committee to the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Coordinating Council. The charter document and by-laws were signed by senior officials of all agencies in January 1998.

Corrections	Department of Corrections
Juvenile Justice	Children, Youth and Family Department

Prosecution	Administrative Office of the District Attorneys
Public Defense	Department of Public Defender
Public Safety	Department of Public Safety
State Court Administration	Administrative Office of the Courts

*Charter:* Executive Agreement

#### *Mission*

To design and to implement a system which assists all participants in the Justice process in accomplishing their work without needless repetition while taking optimal advantage of information technology tools and resources.

#### *Objectives*

A guiding principle is to be able to track a case from arrest through final disposition as the participating departments handle it.

Implementation with the existing departmental systems without replacing those systems is necessary. In other words, the individual departments will continue their own systems as they deem appropriate with integration between departments being provided by JIS.

### **New York**

#### ***County-wide Information System Network (CISNet)***

*Governance:* Tompkins County Board of Representatives

Administrative Services	Tompkins County Administration
Criminal Justice Services	Tompkins County Criminal Justice Services
Department of Motor Vehicles	Department of Motor Vehicles
Information Services	Tompkins County Information Services
Juvenile Justice	Tompkins County Attorney
Local Law Enforcement	Tompkins County Jail
Public Safety	Department of Public Safety
Social Services	Domestic Violence, Community Dispute Resolution (Social Services)

#### *Mission*

CISNET will utilize existing and planned network infrastructures to provide high bandwidth connectivity to a centralized database warehousing facility for use by CISNET affiliated agencies. CISNET staff will endeavor to provide and optimize a client interface that provides access to that database that will satisfy the current and future needs and requirements of the affiliate. CISNET staff will endeavor to facilitate populating the database with the most current, accurate and reliable sources available to Criminal Justice Services and establish procedures and protocols that insure security and confidentiality, which provide the greatest extent of release of information to authorized CISNET affiliates

#### *Vision*

Tompkins County is a demographically and geographically diverse community with a population of approximately 94,000 people located in upstate, central New York. The county has sixteen towns and villages using eight police jurisdictions with village, town, city and county courts. The county criminal justice system has representatives from all county, city, village and town law enforcement agencies.

Most of the smaller agencies either have outdated computer systems or no computer system at all. This is especially true in the outlying courts. The criminal justice agencies that do have access to and knowledge of computer systems function totally independent of one another and the communication and database

technology they use varies by municipality as well.

The county, being so large geographically, results in many of the outlying municipalities being virtually isolated from one another and from the county as a whole. The criminal justice system essentially relies on the postal service and people for transporting information to and from these outlying areas.

Because vital information is not always available to decision-makers at critical stages, delays are often experienced at the arraignment stage. This has a cumulative effect as the cases progress through the system. Judges may opt to remand a defendant to jail because they can't verify a local address or the local bail program isn't notified so the nominal bail amount levied can be paid. This results in additional, often unnecessary, jail time and subsequent court hearings with the attendant costs for transporting of the prisoner, court staff time, pretrial and probation staff as well as attorneys. Getting information that is accurate and complete into the decision-makers hands is vital for the system to operate efficiently.

This problem exists at virtually every stage of the case process. Even after disposition it is important to ensure that information is made available to criminal justice personnel. Court orders made to a defendant or criminal justice agency need to be made known and available as rapidly as possible. The intent of such things as conditions of probation and orders of protection require that more than just the defendant know these orders exist.

### *Objectives*

The Tompkins County Criminal Justice Advisory/Alternatives to Incarceration (CJA/ATI) Board and the County Board of Representatives have agreed that Tompkins County needs a county-wide fully integrated information sharing computer network (CISNet) capable of rapidly exchanging information between law enforcement agencies and tracking criminal cases in a real-time mode. Telecommunication and Information Infrastructure Assistance Program (TIIP) funds will be used to purchase the hardware and software necessary to implement this fully integrated, seamless solution. This new hardware and software, when installed, will interface and use the existing public safety communication network of station-to-car communication capability as well as the county government's own network that heretofore has been used predominantly for e-mail between county departments. It will serve all components of the criminal justice system in Tompkins County both public and not-for-profit. A common database will be developed and implemented. Information gained will be immediately available to authorized users. The resulting system will enable practitioners to respond to crime more efficiently by providing the immediate exchange of information and data via a common format among criminal justice agencies and will provide case management capability to maintain and track cases online (offering in-depth inquiry and reporting capabilities) and for analysis and research purposes. All local agencies involved will be trained on the system and its capabilities. Agencies that require it will also receive basic training on computer capabilities and uses. Ongoing technical support will be provided by the County Information Technology Services. Further, the system will be able to provide information through crime mapping, using historical data to display all incidents of a specific type occurring in a given area. The common database will be designed to accommodate new information as well as integrating existing information from various agencies. The network will interface with existing systems and will be inter-operable with external systems. In addition, the system will utilize photo image technology for mug shots, automated fingerprint identification, and will incorporate an accounting program for fines, payments, and restitution. We envision the development and implementation of Reverse 911 to soon follow as well and be made part of this network. The agencies involved in this network comprise all the service and decision makers of the county criminal justice system. There are forty-eight terminal sites planned. They are: Courts (23 sites): Caroline (2), Cayuga Heights (1), Danby Town (2), Dryden Town (2), Enfield Town (2), Freeville Village (2), Groton Town (1), Ithaca Town (2), Ithaca City and Drug Court (3), Lansing Town (1), Newfield Town (1), Ulysses Town (2), Tompkins County Supreme (2), Tompkins County (1), Tompkins County Family (1); Police (7 sites): Cayuga Heights, Dryden, Groton, Ithaca, New York State, Sheriff, Trumansburg; County Departments (10 sites): Administration, Criminal Justice Services, District Attorney, Probation, Mental health-Forensics, DSS-Support Enforcement, County Clerk, Fire/EMS, Information Technology Services, Jail; Service Agencies (8 sites): Assigned Counsel-public defender, Domestic Offender program, Victim Assistance Program, Task Force For Battered Women, Domestic Violence Prevention Coordinator, Alcoholism Council, City Prosecutor.

## ***eJusticeNY***

### *Governance:* Criminal Justice Technology Group

Comprised of representatives of Executive Department criminal justice agencies, the Judiciary and the Governor's Budget Division, the Criminal Justice Technology Group was created by New York State's Director of Criminal Justice, for the purpose of ensuring the necessary integration of all criminal justice information systems in New York. The primary responsibilities of the Group are to review all proposed and on-going technology initiatives and to examine all project coordination issues. At this time, the Criminal Justice Technology Group is in the early stages of assuming its role as the central coordinating body for development of criminal justice information system technology.

Corrections	Department of Correctional Services
Corrections	Commission of Correction
Criminal Justice Services	Division of Criminal Justice Services
Other	Division of Budget
Parole	Division of Parole
Probation Department	Division of Probation and Correctional Alternatives
State Courts	Unified Court System
State Law Enforcement	Division of State Police
Victim Assistance	Crime Victims' Board

### *Charter:* Authority of Director of Criminal Justice

#### *Mission*

The principle objectives of every information systems improvement initiative will be: (1) To promote the efficient administration of individual criminal justice functions. (2) To ensure the availability of accurate, complete and timely data for the just and efficient apprehension and processing of criminal defendants. (3) To ensure the availability of current, valid statistical information as a means to improve management of the criminal justice system.

#### *Vision*

The ultimate purpose of integrating New York's criminal justice information technology is to establish, and continuously improve, a capability to deliver information, when it is needed. This vision requires that access to data be expanded to the greatest possible number of participants in the criminal justice system; that methods of communication, including vertical and horizontal cross-jurisdictional communication, be improved to ensure that critical data moves efficiently to its users; that new identification technology reaches the people in the system who need it; that standard practices for basic criminal justice processing be adopted statewide and that data, technical and transmission standards be continuously updated and promulgated.

#### *Objectives*

Provide for more and simpler access to information for every component agency of the State's criminal justice community and increase agency efficiency and effectiveness through the development of Web-based products.

Develop, enhance, promote and distribute automated systems for local criminal justice agencies and link these local systems to the State's criminal history repository at the Division of Criminal Justice Services.

Develop and promote standard practices for processing arrest, disposition and corrections data at the State and local level.

Develop and enhance the means to permit the exchange of case and defendant data among local criminal justice agency systems.

Expand development of open standards, client / server applications which will position criminal justice agencies to be more flexible and responsive to changing information needs.

## **North Carolina**

### ***Henderson County Justice Wide Area Network (JWAN)***

*Governance:* Advisory Board

Corrections	Henderson County Day Reporting and Restitution Center
Corrections	Department of Community Corrections
Local Government	Henderson County Administration
State Legislature	North Carolina House of Representatives

#### *Mission*

The mission of the Justice Wide Area Network is to improve the overall efficiency of the Henderson County criminal justice system through enhanced communication and data sharing among agencies.

#### *Objectives*

Electronically link criminal justice agencies to a central file server/database.

Monitor offenders in the criminal justice system.

Improve inter-agency communication.

Collect data for future evaluation, targeting, and long-term criminal justice planning.

Maintain a centralized digital offender photo database.

Track victim restitution collection.

### ***North Carolina Criminal***

*Governance:* CJIN Governance Board

Corrections	NC Department of Correction
County Board of Commissioners	Henderson County Board of Commissioners
Information Services	Information Technology Services
Local Government	Mayor of Morven
Local Law Enforcement	Union County Sheriff's Department
Local Law Enforcement	Fayetteville Police Department
Prosecution	Wilmington District Attorney's Office
Public	NC State Highway Patrol (retired)
Public	Public
Public	NYC Police Department (retired)
Public Safety	Crime Control and Public Safety
State Court Administration	Administrative Office of the Courts
State Law Enforcement	State Bureau of Investigation

*Charter:* Chapter 143 §143-661

§ 143-660. Definitions.

As used in this Article:

- (1) "Board" means the Criminal Justice Information Network Governing Board established by G.S. 143-661.
- (2) "Local government user" means a unit of local government of this State having authorized access to the Network.
- (3) "Network" means the Criminal Justice Information Network established by the Board pursuant to this Article.
- (4) "Network user" or "user" means any person having authorized access to the Network.
- (5) "State agency" means any State department, agency, institution, board, commission, or other unit of State government. (1996, 2nd Ex. Sess., c. 18, s. 23.3(a).)

§ 143-661. Criminal Justice Information Network Governing Board -- creation; purpose; membership; conflicts of interest.

(a) The Criminal Justice Information Network Governing Board is established within the Department of Justice, State Bureau of Investigation, to operate the State's Criminal Justice Information Network, the purpose of which shall be to provide the governmental and technical information systems infrastructure necessary for accomplishing State and local governmental public safety and justice functions in the most effective manner by appropriately and efficiently sharing criminal justice information among law enforcement, judicial, and corrections agencies. The Board is established within the Department of Justice, State Bureau of Investigation, for organizational and budgetary purposes only and the Board shall exercise all of its statutory powers in this Article independent of control by the Department of Justice.

\*(b) The Board shall consist of 15 members, appointed as follows:

(1) Three members appointed by the Governor, including one member who is a director or employee of a State correction agency for a term to begin September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1997, one member who is an employee of the North Carolina Department of Crime Control and Public Safety for a term beginning September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1997, and one member selected from the North Carolina Association of Chiefs of Police for a term to begin September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1999.

(2) Six members appointed by the General Assembly in accordance with G.S. 120-121, as follows:

a. Three members recommended by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, including two members of the general public for terms to begin on September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1997, and one member selected from the North Carolina League of Municipalities who is a member of, or an employee working directly for, the governing board of a North Carolina municipality for a term to begin on September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1999; and

b. Three members recommended by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, including two members of the general public for terms to begin on September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1999, and one member selected from the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners who is a member of, or an employee working directly for, the governing board of a North Carolina county for a term to begin on September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1997.

(3) Two members appointed by the Attorney General, including one member who is an employee of the Attorney General for a term to begin on September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1997, and one member from the North Carolina Sheriffs' Association for a term to begin on September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1999.

(4) Two members appointed by the Chief Justice of the North Carolina Supreme Court, including the Director or an employee of the Administrative Office of the Courts for a term to begin on September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1997, and one member who is either a clerk of the superior court or a district attorney, or employee of a district attorney, for a term to begin on September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1999.

(5) One member appointed by the Chair of the Information Resource Management Commission, who is the

Chair or a member of that Commission, for a term to begin on September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1999.

(6) One member appointed by the President of the North Carolina Chapter of the Association of Public Communications Officials International, who is an active member of the Association, for a term to begin on September 1, 1996 and to expire on June 30, 1999.

The respective appointing authorities are encouraged to appoint persons having a background in and familiarity with criminal information systems and networks generally and with the criminal information needs and capacities of the constituency from which the member is appointed.

As the initial terms expire, subsequent members of the Board shall be appointed to serve four-year terms. At the end of a term, a member shall continue to serve on the Board until a successor is appointed. A member who is appointed after a term is begun serves only for the remainder of the term and until a successor is appointed. Any vacancy in the membership of the Board shall be filled by the same appointing authority that made the appointment, except that vacancies among members appointed by the General Assembly shall be filled in accordance with G.S. 120-122.

(c) Members of the Board shall not be employed by or serve on the board of directors or other corporate governing body of any information systems, computer hardware, computer software, or telecommunications vendor of goods and services to the State or to any unit of local government in the State. No member of the Board shall vote on an action affecting solely the member's own State agency or local governmental unit or specific judicial office.(1996, 2nd Ex. Sess., c. 18, s. 23.3(a).)

§ 143-662. Compensation and expenses of Board members; travel reimbursements.

Members of the Board shall serve without compensation but may receive travel and subsistence as follows:

(1) Board members who are officials or employees of a State agency or unit of local government, in accordance with G.S. 138-6.

(2) All other Board members, at the rate established in G.S. 138-5.(1996, 2nd Ex. Sess., c. 18, s. 23.3(a).)

§ 143-663. Powers and duties.

(a) The Board shall have the following powers and duties:

(1) To establish and operate the Network as an integrated system of State and local government components for effectively and efficiently storing, communicating, and using criminal justice information at the State and local levels throughout North Carolina's law enforcement, judicial, and corrections agencies, with the components of the Network to include electronic devices, programs, data, and governance and to set the Network's policies and procedures.

(2) To develop and adopt uniform standards and cost-effective information technology, after thorough evaluation of the capacity of information technology to meet the present and future needs of the State and, in consultation with the Information Resource Management Commission, to develop and adopt standards for entering, storing, and transmitting information in criminal justice databases and for achieving maximum compatibility among user technologies.

(3) To identify the funds needed to establish and maintain the Network, identify public and private sources of funding, and secure funding to:

a. Create the Network and facilitate the sharing of information among users of the Network; and

b. Make grants to local government users to enable them to acquire or improve elements of the Network that lie within the responsibility of their agencies or State agencies; provided that the elements developed with the funds must be available for use by the State or by local governments without cost and the applicable State agencies join in the request for funding.

(4) To provide assistance to local governments for the financial and systems planning for Network-related automation and to coordinate and assist the Network users of this State in soliciting bids for information technology hardware, software, and services in order to assure compliance with the Board's technical standards, to gain the most advantageous contracts for the Network users of this State, and to assure financial accountability where State funds are used.

(5) To provide a liaison among local government users and to advocate on behalf of the Network and its users in connection with legislation affecting the Network.

(6) To facilitate the sharing of knowledge about information technologies among users of the Network.

(7) To take any other appropriate actions to foster the development of the Network.

(b) All grants or other uses of funds appropriated or granted to the Board shall be conditioned on compliance with the Board's technical and other standards.(1996, 2nd Ex. Sess., c. 18, s. 23.3(a).)

#### *Objectives*

Reduce time it takes to positively identify suspects.

Create a single, comprehensive criminal history.

Develop a single source of outstanding warrants.

Reduce/eliminate redundant data entry.

Implement a statewide, interagency mobile voice and data communications system.

### **North Dakota**

#### ***North Dakota Criminal Justice Information Sharing Plan***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Information Board

Currently, there is a Board, Executive Committee, and an Advisory Committee. In addition, a Policy Group and Operational Group exist as subsets of the Advisory Committee. The Executive Committee includes the Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Department, and representatives from the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, State Radio Communications, Highway Patrol, State's Attorneys Association, Chief of Police Association, and Sheriff's Association. Subcommittees: Criminal Justice Information Executive Committee: address specific technical objectives for electronic sharing of criminal justice information. Advisory Committee: advise Board. Policy Group: subset of Advisory Committee. Operational Group: subset of Advisory Committee.

*Charter:* Executive Order 2001-01 and Memorandum of Understanding

#### **EXECUTIVE ORDER 2001-01**

WHEREAS, Criminal Justice Information Systems are currently being used, acquired and developed by local and state criminal justice agencies across North Dakota; and

WHEREAS, the focus of future federal funding will be to support the integration of Criminal Justice Information Systems; and

WHEREAS, there exists a need to coordinate a cost effective means of sharing criminal justice information among authorized agencies and parties; and

WHEREAS, the executive and judicial branches of government have begun discussions with local government regarding the means and structure by which integration of criminal justice information can occur,

NOW THEREFORE, I, John Hoeven, Governor of the State of North Dakota, by the authority vested in me in collaboration with the judicial branch of government, do hereby establish the Criminal Justice Information Board to be comprised of the heads of branches of government and agencies as set forth below:

\* Chief Justice of the North Dakota Supreme Court, or his designee

\* North Dakota Attorney General or his designee and

\* The Director of the ND Information Technology Department as the designee of the Governor of North Dakota

It is further ordered that the Director of the Information Technology Department (ITD) shall chair the Criminal Justice Information Board and will provide staff support to the Board. The Board will set policy



relating to the collection, storage and sharing of criminal justice information and the systems necessary to perform such functions, consistent with North Dakota law and federal law and policy as applicable.

It is further ordered that a Criminal Justice Information Executive Committee is hereby established, to be comprised of representatives from the entities as set forth below:

ND Information Technology Department

ND Highway Patrol

ND Judicial Branch

ND State's Attorney's Association

ND Attorney General

ND Chief's of Police Association

ND Department of Corrections

ND Sheriff's Association

ND State Radio

The Criminal Justice Information Executive Committee will address specific technical objectives for electronic sharing of criminal justice information, serve as an advisory council and make recommendations for policy decisions to the Board.

This order is issued upon the following basis and for the following reasons:

1. The National Governor's Association and the Department of Justice have requested the governor of each state to direct coordination efforts regarding criminal justice information systems.
2. Coordination of such efforts will result in cost savings, more complete data collection, and more effective collection, storage and transmittal of information among all levels of state government.
3. This Executive Order is issued pursuant to Article V, Sections 1 and 7 of the North Dakota Constitution.

Memo of Understanding

01/29/01

North Dakota Criminal Justice Information Plan

Whereas, state and local members of the North Dakota Criminal Justice community pledge to work in partnership in promoting the development of electronic information sharing; and

Whereas, state and local members of the North Dakota Criminal Justice community believe that the safety and security of North Dakota citizens will be enhanced by the accurate and timely sharing of information, and

Whereas, state and local criminal justice agencies are committed to the cost efficient, secure, and effective exchange of electronic data; and

Whereas, state and local criminal justice agencies pledge to work cooperatively in the development and implementation of an information plan to insure compatibility, accuracy and efficiency of information sharing between automated criminal justice systems.

Therefore, the undersigned agree to the following:

State and local parties agree that no criminal justice information system or related component will be designed, developed, or integrated into the network without effective participation of state and local stakeholders.

The Department of Transportation (DOT), Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (DOCR), the Judicial Branch, the Highway Patrol, State Radio and the Attorney General (AG) will actively work to ensure that their new or enhanced information systems are designed to provide for the electronic sharing of information.

The North Dakota Association of Counties, the North Dakota State's Attorneys Association (NDSAA), the Peace Officers Association, the League of Cities, Indian Affairs Commission, and the Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs agree to promote the benefits and cost effectiveness of the Criminal Justice Information Plan and actively support and encourage cooperation and coordination in local system design that assures compatibility and integration with other state and local systems.

The Information Technology Department agrees to support a Project Coordinator for the development and stewardship of the Criminal Justice Information Plan.

The undersigned pledge to support the development and implementation of a Criminal Justice Information Plan through cooperative dialogue within the forums known as the Criminal Justice Information Executive Committee, and the Criminal Justice Information Board and the Criminal Justice Advisory Committee.

This agreement will remain in effect from the date of signature until December, 2002 at which time a renewal will be considered.

#### *Objectives*

Establish a governance structure.

Improve disposition reporting.

Improve access to protection orders.

Reduce delays in processing traffic citations.

Consolidate court information.

Improve access to court information.

Document requirements and design the information sharing architecture.

Develop data standards.

Identify and implement priority projects.

## **Ohio**

### ***Ohio Criminal Justice***

#### *Governance: CJIS Policy Board*

CJIS Policy Board is responsible for the initiation of the CJIS planning effort. In the future, a CJIS Executive Board will be established to provide executive direction and oversight to CJIS improvement initiatives. The Executive Board should include the following members:

Governor

State Attorney General

Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Ohio

President of the Buckeye State Sheriff's Association

President of the Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police

President of the Ohio Prosecuting Attorney's Association

The Executive Board will oversee the work of the Policy Board, which will continue to provide management and technical expertise to craft policies and manage strategic initiatives. In addition, four Regional Working Groups have been organized to provide input to the CJIS Policy Board.

Administrative Services	Department of Administrative Services
Clerk of Court	Clerk of Court Office, Fayette County
Corrections	Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections
Crime Information Center	Regional Crime Information Center

Criminal Justice Services	Office of Criminal Justice Services
Department of Motor Vehicles	Department of Public Safety - Bureau of Motor Vehicles
Governor's Office	Governor's Office
Information System	Northwestern Ohio Regional Information System
Information System	Cuyahoga Regional Information System
Juvenile Justice	Ohio Department of Youth Services, Information Systems and Development
Local Courts	Circleville Municipal Court
Local Courts	Delaware County Court of Common Pleas
Local Law Enforcement	Montgomery County Sheriff's Office
Local Law Enforcement	Lucas County Sheriff's Office
Local Law Enforcement	Ohio Association of Chiefs of Police
Local Law Enforcement	Buckeye State Sheriff's Association
Probation Department	Cuyahoga County Adult Probation Department
Prosecution	Ohio Prosecuting Attorneys Association
State Courts	Supreme Court of Ohio
State Law Enforcement	Ohio Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation
State Law Enforcement	Ohio State Highway Patrol

*Charter:* Joint effort of the Lieutenant Governor and the Attorney General

#### *Mission*

To coordinate the development of information technology systems and services supporting administration and strategic management of the criminal justice system. These systems and services will:

Provide criminal justice practitioners with comprehensive, timely, and accurate information about subjects in contact with the criminal justice system.

Enhance public safety, due process, and equal access to the criminal justice system.

Reduce redundant document preparation, data entry, transmission, and storage.

Maintain individual privacy rights.

Promote appropriate access controls and security.

Support the development of criminal justice policy.

#### *Objectives*

Maintain a cooperative CJIS community and representative governance structure that supports an information technology environment that meets the evolving needs of criminal justice practitioners.

Develop compatible, networked criminal justice systems that reduce duplicative efforts.

Develop recommended policies, procedures, and statutes that enhance the exchange of information within the criminal justice community.

Improve the completeness of the automated data maintained by criminal justice agencies.

Through cost containment incentives and identification of possible funding sources, economically assist jurisdictions to participate in Ohio CJIS.

## Oklahoma

### *Oklahoma Integrated Criminal Justice Information System*

*Governance:* Oklahoma Criminal Justice Information Systems Task Force

The Oklahoma Drug and Violent Crime Policy Board, which is under the guidance of the Oklahoma District Attorneys Council, created the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Information Systems Task Force. The Board has a diverse makeup of criminal justice representatives from both state and local levels of government. Additionally, there is representation from non-criminal justice agencies, which are impacted by the Board's activities such as the Department of Education, Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse, and local regional governing bodies. The CJIS Task Force, composed of seven state agencies and two associations identified previously, meets in open meetings and actively seeks the input of other entities, both criminal justice as well as non-criminal justice agencies, associations, and individuals.

Corrections	Oklahoma Department of Corrections (DOC)
Crime Control	Oklahoma Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drug Control (OBNDDC)
Juvenile Justice	Oklahoma Office of Juvenile Affairs (OJA)
Local Law Enforcement	Oklahoma Sheriff's Association
Local Law Enforcement	Oklahoma Association of Chiefs of Police
Prosecution	Oklahoma District Attorneys Council (DAC)
Public Safety	OK Dept. of Public Safety
	OK Law Enforcement Telecommunications System (OLETS)
State Court Administration	Oklahoma Administrative Office of the Court (AOC)
State Repository	Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation (OSBI)

#### *Mission*

It is the Mission of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Information Systems Task Force to facilitate a statewide plan which will provide a seamless sharing of criminal justice information, built on standardization and coordination, while reducing unnecessary redundancy, to improve the collection, assimilation, and delivery of criminal justice data both for criminal justice and non-criminal justice purpose.

#### *Vision*

It is the Vision of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Information Systems Task Force that anyone seeking Oklahoma criminal justice data for criminal or non-criminal justice purposes have a single point of contact to acquire such information, and that such information is timely, complete and accurate.

#### *Objectives*

It is the objective of our efforts to allow each agency to operate independently in meeting their mission, but to do so by sharing criminal justice information without the needless waste of critical resources through unnecessary redundant actions.

Preliminary efforts to set goals for our integration efforts resulted in the following ten statements. These statements serve as the starting point for our overall objectives and are currently being fine tuned in some cases while others are already, or being, implemented:

- 1) Every Oklahoma criminal justice agency shall be able to determine if a person is the subject of an Oklahoma warrant and VPO within one minute, with warrants and VPO currency of three hours.
- 2) Every Oklahoma criminal justice agency shall be able to determine the Oklahoma correctional status (incarcerated, on parole, on probation, under community services or correctional supervision) within two minutes, with status currency of 24 hours.

- 3) Every Oklahoma criminal justice agency shall be able to determine if a person has an Oklahoma criminal history within two minutes, with history currency of 24 hours.
- 4) Every Oklahoma criminal justice agency shall be able to obtain the Oklahoma criminal history record of a person who has one, within 4 minutes, with history currency of 24 hours.
- 5) Every Oklahoma criminal history will include information about every Oklahoma felony and misdemeanor arrest or offense that would be a felony or misdemeanor if committed by an adult.
- 6) The Oklahoma criminal history system will include a history of each reception to and discharge from any correctional facility, parole, probation and post-sentence supervision.
- 7) The Oklahoma criminal history will include a final disposition for each charge of each arrest; a final disposition is a decline to prosecute, conviction, acquittal, dismissal, and for convictions it will also include the sentence.
- 8) Every Oklahoma criminal justice agency shall be able to exchange electronic mail (e-mail) with any other Oklahoma criminal justice agency.
- 9) Each Oklahoma criminal justice agency shall have access to a case management system suitable for its in-agency use and for preparing and transmitting required reports to every criminal justice agency.
- 10) Every Oklahoma criminal justice agency shall have direct electronic access to national criminal justice information systems.

## **Oregon**

### ***Oregon Criminal Justice Information Standards (CJIS) Program***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Information Standards Advisory Board

*Charter:* Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) 181.725

181.715 Criminal Justice Information System established; duties; application

1. The Department of State Police shall establish a Criminal Justice Information System that coordinates information among state criminal justice agencies. The system shall:

Insure that in developing new information systems data can be retrieved to support evaluation of criminal justice programs and planning;

Insure that maximum effort is made for the safety of public safety officers;

Establish methods and standards for data interchange and information access between criminal justice information systems, in compliance with the technology standards and policies of the Oregon Department of Administrative Services;

Design and implement improved applications for exchange of agency information; and

Implement the capability to exchange images between criminal justice agencies.

2. As used in this section and ORS 181.720, "criminal justice agencies" includes, but is not limited to:

The Judicial Department;

The Department of Corrections;

The Department of State Police;

The Department of Transportation;

The State Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision;

The State Board on Public Safety Standards and Training;

The State Department of Fish and Wildlife; and

The Oregon Liquor Control Commission. [1993 c.188 §5]

#### 181.720 Duties of state criminal justice agencies.

State criminal justice agencies, as part of their biennial information resource management plan, shall address the goals of the Criminal Justice Information System with particular attention to data access, availability and information sharing among criminal justice agencies. The plans must be based on industry standards for open systems to the greatest extent possible. A state criminal justice agency shall submit a copy of its information resource management plan to the Criminal Justice Information Systems Advisory Board. [1993 c.188 §7]

181.725 Criminal Justice Information System Advisory Board; members; expenses. (1) There is established a Criminal Justice Information Systems Advisory Board to advise the Department of State Police in the department's duties under ORS 181.715. The board consists of the following members:

The State Court Administrator or the administrator's designee;

The Director of the Department of Corrections or the director's designee;

The Superintendent of State Police or the superintendent's designee;

The Executive Director of the Oregon Criminal Justice Commission or the executive director's designee;

The Director of Transportation or the director's designee;

The chairperson of the State Board of Parole and Post-Prison Supervision or the chairperson's designee;

The executive director of the Board on Public Safety Standards and Training or the executive director's designee;

A chief of police designated by the Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police;

A sheriff designated by the Oregon Sheriff's Association;

A jail manager designated by the Oregon Jail Managers' Association; and

The administrator of the information resource management division of the Oregon Department of Administrative Services or the administrator's designee.

(2) The board shall meet at such times and places as the board deems necessary.

The members of the board are not entitled to compensation but are entitled to expenses as provided in ORS 292.495. [1993 c. 188 §6]

#### 181.730 Law Enforcement Data System established; duties; rules.

There is established in the Department of State Police a Law Enforcement Data System.

The Law Enforcement Data System shall:

Install and maintain a criminal justice telecommunication and information system for storage and retrieval of criminal justice information submitted by criminal justice agencies for the state of Oregon;

Function as the control point for access to similar programs operated by other states and the Federal Government;

Undertake other projects as are necessary or appropriate for the speedy collection and dissemination of information relating to crime and criminals; and

Provide service as available to all qualified criminal justice agencies and designated agencies.

(3) The department may adopt rules establishing procedures for the submission, access and dissemination of information by the Law Enforcement Data System. [1993 c.188 §8]

#### *Objectives*

Ensure that in developing new information systems, data can be retrieved to support evaluation of criminal justice programs and planning.

Ensure that maximum effort is made for the safety of public safety officers.

Establish methods and standards for data interchange and information access between criminal justice information systems, in compliance with the technology standards and policies of the Oregon Department of Administrative Services.

Design and implement improved applications for exchange of agency information.

Implement the capability to exchange images between criminal justice agencies.

## **Pennsylvania**

### ***Pennsylvania Justice Network (JNET)***

*Governance:* Executive Council (Overall Policy); Steering Committee (Tactical Deployment)

Executive Council sets forth the overall policy and strategic direction for the JNET project and consists of chief executives from justice and justice-affiliated organizations (see Membership below). JNET Senior Policy Team is an oversight team chaired by the Deputy Secretary for Information Technology (IT). The Team monitors the overall JNET project compliance with established statewide policy, budget, information technology standards and initiatives. JNET Steering Committee is comprised of representatives from the justice and justice affiliated organizations who establish the tactical deployment plan for implementation of the JNET project. In addition, there are various subcommittees that meet as part of the JNET project: Application Support Subcommittee, Communications Subcommittee, County Integration Subcommittee, Data Conflict Subcommittee, Evaluation Subcommittee, Event Messaging Subcommittee, Finance Subcommittee, Legislative Subcommittee, Offender Identification Subcommittee, Operations & Connections Subcommittee, Security Subcommittee, Technology Subcommittee, and Training Subcommittee.

Administration Department	Governor's Office of Administration
Corrections	Department of Corrections
Criminal Justice Services	Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency
Department of Motor Vehicles	Pennsylvania Department of Transportation
Governor's Office	Governor's Office
Juvenile Justice	Juvenile Court Judges Commission
Other	Office of Inspector General
Other	Governor's Office of General Counsel
Other	Governor's Office of Budget
Other	Governor's Policy Office
Parole	Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole
Prosecution	Office of Attorney General
Social Services	Department of Public Welfare
State Court Administration	Administrative Office of Pennsylvania Courts
State Law Enforcement	Pennsylvania State Police

*Charter:* Executive Order

#### *Vision*

To enhance public safety through the integration of criminal justice information throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by adopting business practices that promote cost effectiveness, information sharing and timely and appropriate access to information while recognizing the independence of each agency.

#### *Objectives*

Create a system with a single source of entry which reduces redundancy and improves efficiency.

## **Rhode Island**

### ***Rhode Island Justice Link Public Safety Network (J-LINK)***

*Governance:* Governor's Justice Commission's Technical Advisory Committee, Governor's Justice Commission Steering Committee

In 1995, the Governor's Justice Commission Steering Committee and Policy Board determined that an integrated and comprehensive statewide computer information system was the top criminal justice priority for the state. The Steering Committee formed a Technical Advisory Committee, comprised of agency representatives with specific expertise in the area of computers/management information systems, to oversee the development of the Rhode Island J-LINK. MIS and policy representatives from all state criminal justice agencies have met monthly since 1995.

Corrections	Department of Corrections
Justice Cabinet	Governor's Justice Commission
Juvenile Justice	Department for Children, Youth and Families (DCYF)
Local Law Enforcement	RI Police Chiefs Association
Prosecution	Attorney General's Office
Public Defense	Office of the Public Defender
State Courts	RI Supreme Court
State Law Enforcement	State Police
Transportation	Department of Transportation

#### *Mission*

The primary goal of J-LINK is to create a comprehensive, computer network servicing the state's criminal justice system.

#### *Objectives*

Enhance the safety of police officers, victims, and specifically, the general public.

Eliminate duplicative data entry.

Allow for the immediate update and exchange of criminal offender records between the state and local agencies comprising the Rhode Island criminal justice system, and transmission of data to federal departments.

## **South Carolina**

### ***South Carolina Criminal Justice Information System Initiative***

*Governance:* Information Resources Council

The CJIS Committee is a component of the Information Resources Council, which is established through Executive Order of the Governor. Members of the IRC are appointed by the Governor and include private business, public agency and legislative leaders.

Financial Office	Budget and Control Board
Governor's Office	Governor's Office
Local Government	Local Government
Private Industry	Private Industry
State Legislature	State Legislature



*Charter: Executive Order of the Governor 99-10*

Executive Order of the Governor 99-10

WHEREAS, South Carolina Code Sections 1-11-430 (1989) and 11-35-1580 (1997), and South Carolina Regulations 19-445.2000, et seq. establish obligations to South Carolinians to improve efficiency, State Government is responsible for, among other things, providing broad-based accessibility to goods, services, and information resources including, but not limited to public safety; public health and welfare; education; financial, human, natural and environmental resources management; economic development; transportation; enhancing quality of life; and insuring the optimal performance of government through the efficient and effective use of technology, and

WHEREAS, information and information resources, including technologies residing in the various agencies of state, local and regional governments, in addition to being a means by which governments can be optimized, are strategic assets belonging to the people of South Carolina that should be coordinated and managed as valuable resources to allow citizens to readily acquire information, goods and services, and

WHEREAS, State Government has been involved with, and participated in a number of state, regional and national information technology efforts resources to allow citizens and businesses to readily acquire information, goods and services, including network-based applications of various government functions, such as electronic benefits transfer (EBT), electronic parent locator services (EPLN), child support (CSENet), taxpaying services (TaxConnect and Telefile), electronic commerce legislation, high-speed research network (Internet 2), statewide voice and data communications (SCIN/ETN), K-12 School and Public Library Initiative, a Consolidated State Data Center, and information services, nationally and internationally (Internet, and World Wide Web services); and

WHEREAS, state, regional, and local governments should seek to operate as a single enterprise whose goal is to provide consistent, integrated information and services to all citizens, by identifying core programmatic competencies, sharing skills and expertise, and utilization of a shared, statewide, state-of-the-art technology architecture.

WHEREAS, the need for the transfer of information among all levels of government, in the most timely and useful form possible, requires a uniform policy and coordinated approach for the use and acquisition of information resources and technologies, and,

WHEREAS, with appropriate privacy and security considerations, well-designed, planned, and managed information resources and interoperable, interconnected technologies among agencies and programs can support sharing information resources across programmatic, agency, governmental, institutional, and other public and private-sector lines, and,

WHEREAS, principles of business and management must be applied to government processes, and private sector resources should be brought together to assist in identifying those opportunities where the investment in shared, coordinated information technology, infrastructure, equipment, or redesigned governmental processes will provide the greatest benefit and improve the availability of services and information to the citizens, without regard to location, while increasing efficiency, reducing costs, and promoting economic development; and

WHEREAS, information technology is a critically important resource to successful, competitive business organizations and to service-oriented government agencies in South Carolina; and

WHEREAS, State government can provide the leadership needed to maximize the application of information technology as a means for promoting economic development across the state and thereby improve the quality of life for all South Carolinians; and

WHEREAS, the State with its various agencies and institutions of government, desires to build a government information infrastructure using state-of-the-art architecture; develop optimum information functionality within the public sector, between the public and economic sectors, and between the public sector and the general public; and assess and develop the roles of government (state, regional, and local) in promoting information technology infrastructure, and

WHEREAS, the South Carolina Information Resources Council was established by Executive Order Number 96-05, as amended by Executive Orders 97-11 and 97-13, and

WHEREAS, the undersigned has determined that Executive Orders 96-05, 97-11 and 97-13 must be modified in certain particulars,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDERED, that:

1. There is hereby created the Information Resources Council of South Carolina, to:

- (a) assist agencies in the development and implementation of sound business plans that include information technology plans that address the effective and efficient use of information resources and technologies;
- (b) oversee and coordinate development of statewide policies, standards, strategies, goals and objectives derived from sound business plans that address the enterprise-wide planning, management and use of information resources and technologies;
- (c) oversee and coordinate development of a statewide information infrastructure that supports the State's information resources planning initiatives toward: ACCESS; OPTIMIZATION; MEASUREMENT; AND INNOVATION;
- (d) foster interagency and intergovernmental project funding and management that share staff, budgets, information resources, and facilities;
- (e) provide a forum that encourages innovation and creativity in the application of information resources and stimulates defining and resolving barriers to efficient and effective development, use and sharing of information resources among public, private, national, state and local interests;
- (f) provide leadership and guidance in the continued development of integrated statewide networks that cost-effectively facilitate sharing of and access to information, computing and communications resources;
- (g) oversee, coordinate, and improve the delivery of services to the general public and to the private sector by expanding government's use of technology; and
- (h) provide advice on policy issues related to technology.

The Information Resources Council of South Carolina shall consist of fifteen members.

(a) Governor shall appoint:

- i. Three members representing regional, county and municipal governments;
- ii. Two members representing business/programmatic/technology interests within state agencies or institutions;
- iii. One member representing academic or research interests;
- iv. Five members representing the private sector; and
- v. One member representing the Office of the Governor.

(b) In addition, the Council shall include:

- i. Two members representing the General Assembly, one member appointed by the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and one member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and,
- ii. One member representing the Budget and Control Board to be appointed by the Executive Director.

The Council to be appointed shall reflect a cross-section of the functional areas of government.

AND FURTHER, the membership plan shall have a system for sub-committees and work groups that will draw upon government agencies and special membership groups so as to bring to bear all available expertise on issues the Council addresses.

The Office of the Executive Director of the State Budget and Control Board shall provide the Council with such primary support and resources as it may request and as he deems proper; including requesting that State agencies cooperate fully with the council and provide staff support, as needed; directing the State's Information Technology Advisory Committee to make recommendations to the Council regarding its proposed information technology resources planning, policies, procedures, standards, etc.; and appointing a secretary to coordinate and direct all staff support.

The Council shall submit to the Office of the Governor, annually, a report on the State's technology inventory, including its infrastructure, workforce, management, critical applications, goals and objectives, along with a report documenting the information resource strategies promulgated by the Council and progress-to-date on their implementation.

UPON CONSIDERATION AND EVALUATION OF THE COUNCIL'S ANNUAL REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, I will consult with the Council concerning such further action as is appropriate.

#### *Mission*

The mission of the Information Resources Council is to provide leadership, guidance and direction in the development of a statewide information technology management strategy (including that for criminal justice) which:

- Is linked to agency business and information plans;
- Serves as a blueprint for the systematic development and enhancement of a world-class governmental information infrastructure;
- Promotes interagency and intergovernmental (federal, regional, state and local) sharing of information resources and core competencies to improve governmental performance;
- Recommends statewide policies, standards, strategies, goals, objectives, and measurements for how information resources should be evaluated, developed, implemented, and enhanced; and
- Encourages innovation and creativity in the application of effective, efficient, integrated, statewide information resources to issues of access, optimization, and defining and resolving barriers to the provision of quality governmental information, goods and services.

#### *Vision*

The vision of the Information Resources Council (Criminal Justice Information System Committee) is that South Carolina will be an acknowledged leader in using (criminal) information resources (in the administration of justice) to benefit its people and businesses.

#### *Objectives*

Provide automated access to (criminal justice) information held by South Carolina governments.

Provide seamless access to South Carolina (criminal justice) services.

Utilize South Carolina (criminal justice) information technology resources effectively and efficiently.

Enhance and manage an effective integrated communications network capable of supporting the South Carolina Information Technology vision.

Provide data integrity and security. Develop an informational infrastructure that minimizes data redundancy and functional duplication while encouraging the sharing of core competencies across the (criminal justice system).

Provide mechanisms and accountability for standards to ensure interoperability among government entities in support of the vision of (the) State Information Technology plan.

## **Tennessee**

### ***Davidson County Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS)***

*Governance:* Policy Committee

The Policy Committee is the primary decision and policy-making entity of JIS. The Policy Committee coordinates, approves and implements the design, development, and ongoing management of the JIS. The Policy Committee consists of the one judge from the Criminal, Circuit, Chancery and General Sessions courts. For multi-judge courts, the judges to serve as representatives on the Policy Committee are selected by a majority vote of the judges of each court. Additional members include the Police Chief, the Sheriff, the District Attorney General, the Public Defender, the Juvenile Clerk, the Criminal Court Clerk, the

Circuit Court Clerk, and the Chancery Clerk and Master. The Operations Subcommittee provides day-to-day assistance and guidance to the Director of JIS regarding financial management and operations and is a subgroup of the Policy Committee. Additionally, the Operations Subcommittee has the responsibility to review and recommend policies and procedures having multiple organizational impacts; to provide a focus for the current and future justice systems studies; and to provide a knowledge base for understanding the interrelated Metro justice processes, and how changes in any part of these processes will have an impact on the total system. Operations Subcommittee: provides day-to-day assistance and guidance to the Director of JIS. Change Control Board: evaluates, prioritizes, and approves all changes to the baseline systems. JIGSAW (Juvenile Information Group System Awareness Workers): reviews/approves all deliverables, implements process changes, and recommends procedure changes to Juvenile Judge and Clerk. Implementation Team: responsible for the implementation of each module, resolves post-implementation issues.

Clerk of Court	Criminal Court Clerk
Information Services	Justice Information System
Jail Management	Davidson County Sheriff's Office
Juvenile Justice	Juvenile Court/Clerk, Juvenile Probation
Local Court Administration	General Sessions Court Administrator
Local Courts	General Sessions Judges, Commissioners
Local Law Enforcement	Metro Police Department
Other	DUI School
Pre-trial Services	Pretrial Services
Probation Department	General Sessions Probation, Community Corrections
Prosecution	District Attorney General's Office
Public Defense	Public Defender's Office
State Court Administration	State Trial Court Administrator
State Courts	State Trial Court Criminal Judges

*Charter:* Ordinance No. 092-415

#### ORDINANCE NO. 092.- 415 - AN ORDINANCE CREATING AND PROVIDING FOR THE JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM OF THE METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT

WHEREAS, it is deemed to be in the best interest of the metropolitan Government to create and provide for the Justice information System of the metropolitan Government.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT EXACTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY-

#### SECTION 1: Creation.

There is hereby created the Justice Information System of the Metropolitan Government (JIS).

#### SECTION 2: Purpose.

The purpose of the JIS is to improve the administration of justice through the creation and operation of comprehensive integrated management information systems and to promulgate and implement minimum uniform standards for all participating agencies. The goals to be accomplished are to: (1) create a modern simplified system or systems for managing justice information; (2) provide quick and easy access to information; (3) expedite case processing; (4) enhance productivity and efficiency by the use of technology; (5) reduce costs and increase revenue; and (6) plan for future needs.

#### SECTION 3: Membership.

Those eligible for membership in the JIB are the following elected or appointed officials. Chancery Court Judges, Circuit Court Clerk, Circuit Court Judges, Clerk and Master, Criminal Court Clerk, Criminal Court Judges, District Attorney General, Juvenile Court Clerk, Juvenile Court judge, Metropolitan General Sessions Court Judges, Probate Court judge, public defender and Sheriff.

#### SECTION 4: Policy committee.

The Policy Committee will be the primary decision and policy making entity of the JIB. The Policy Committee shall coordinate, approve and implement the design, development and operation of the JIS. only members of the TIS shall be eligible to serve on the Policy Committee. The Policy Committee shall adopt bylaws to provide for the governance of the JIS.

#### SECTION 5: Presiding Officer.

Pursuant to the bylaws, the members of JIS shall select a presiding officer who shall act as the administrative head of JIS and who shall serve in that capacity for a term established by the by-laws.

#### SECTION 6: Powers.

The JIS shall have the power to:

1. Establish bylaws, policies, procedures and standards for the development and ongoing management of justice related information systems which will be integrated
2. Enforce the Bylaws, procedures, policies and standards set by the JIS;
3. Provide a centralized mechanism for the acquisition and maintenance of all justice related automated solutions;
4. Employ such persons and maintain such facilities as are necessary to exercise the powers and perform the duties of JIS within its budgetary limitations;
5. In conformity with applicable legal requirements of the Metropolitan Government, authorize or enter into contracts and purchase or lease such equipment, software, services and supplies as, necessary to exercise the powers and perform the duties of the JIS; and
6. Take such other actions as are necessary to further the purpose of the JIS.

#### SECTION 7: Duties.

The JIS shall have the duty to:

1. Provide assistance to each of the JIS participating agencies in assessing their automation needs;
2. Provide an accounting of revenues 0011OCt - ad by JIS on behalf of each participating agency (when amounts are attributable to a participating agency);
3. Provide each JIS agency with supportive services in the 'form of installation, training and maintenance for JIS approved hardware and software which is not shared between two or more JIS agencies;
4. Provide each JIS agency with supportive services in the form of installation, training, electronic back- up and maintenance for hardware, software and data that is shared between two or more JIS agencies;
5. Provide services to ensure data integrity within the parameters established by the Policy Committee; and
- 6- Insure that all automated solutions conform to the general government-wide standards of the Metropolitan Government and participate in the formulation and revision of those standards.

#### SECTION 8: Exemption.

All employees Of the JIS shall be exempt from the classified service and from civil service regulations.

SECTION 9: This Ordinance shall take effect from and after its final passage, the welfare of The Metropolitan Government of Nashville and Davidson County requiring it.

#### *Mission*

To improve the administration of justice through the creation and operation of comprehensive integrated

management information systems and to promulgate and implement minimum uniform standards for all participating agencies. The goals to be accomplished are: create a modern simplified system or systems for managing justice information; provide quick and easy access to information; expedite case processing; enhance productivity and efficiency by the use of technology; reduce costs and increase revenue; plan for future needs.

#### *Vision*

The creation of the Justice Information System (JIS) represents recognition that a multi-jurisdictional body is necessary to improve the local justice system through greater coordination and cooperation of elected officials. The members of the JIS recognize that it is only through common action, communication, and purpose that the goal of establishing integrated justice information systems will be achieved.

#### *Objectives*

Reduction of repetitive tasks.

Enhancement of data quality.

Increased information accessibility.

Increased organizational integration.

Enhancement of statistical reporting and monitoring.

Increased effectiveness.

### ***Knox County Justice Information Management System (JIMS)***

*Governance:* JIMS Policy Board

Clerk of Court	General Sessions Court Clerk
Clerk of Court	Criminal Court Clerk
Local Courts	Judges
Local Law Enforcement	Sheriff's Office
Local Law Enforcement	Knoxville Police Department
Prosecution	Attorney General's Office
Public Defense	Public Defender's Office

#### *Objectives*

Eliminate all paper processes that could be automated.

## **Texas**

### ***Harris County Justice Information***

*Governance:* Executive Board

The Executive Board was formed in 1971 and began meeting regularly in early 1973. In March 1998, the Commissioner's Court established a new JIMS charter which charged the Executive Board with developing strategies to meet "the needs of Harris County in the administration of justice both now and in the future." Management Committee: plans strategic direction for development of JIMS. Southeast Texas Crime Information Center Users Group: assists with regional law enforcement system. Gang-related Information Tracking System Executive Committee: creates standards for collecting gang information. JIMS Department: JIMS Department oversees daily operations. JIMS Technical Group: coordinates software and hardware changes.

Clerk of Court	District Clerk
Clerk of Court	County Clerk

Local Courts	District Courts Trying Juvenile Cases
Local Courts	County Criminal Courts at Law
Local Courts	County Civil Courts at Law
Local Courts	District Courts Trying Family Cases
Local Courts	District Courts Trying Civil Cases
Local Courts	District Courts Trying Criminal Cases
Local Courts	Justice of the Peace Courts
Local Law Enforcement	Harris County Sheriff's Department
Local Law Enforcement	Harris County Constable's Office
Prosecution	Harris County District Attorney's Office

*Charter:* Commissioner's Court

*Mission*

The JIMS Program mission is to assist end user agencies in the timely delivery of their mandated services by providing the highest quality automated information systems, and the support for those systems, at the lowest possible cost by employing state-of-the-art techniques, technologies and methodologies.

*Objectives*

Locate, track, identify, charge, book, prosecute and supervise criminal offenders.

File and process civil cases.

Automate jury management.

Automate payroll.

***Texas Integrated Justice Information System***

*Governance:* State Agency Justice Information Coordinating Committee

Auditor's Office	Texas State Auditor's Office
Corrections	Texas Department of Criminal Justice
Corrections	Texas Youth Commission
Criminal Justice Services	Texas Criminal Justice Policy Council
Governor's Office	Criminal Justice Division (proposed)
Information Resources	Texas Department of Information Resources
Probation Department	Texas Juvenile Probation Commission
Public Safety	Texas Department of Public Safety
State Court Administration	Office of Court Administration

*Mission*

To coordinate the development and operation of statewide justice systems maintained or managed by the participating state agencies so that those systems are able to share information in a manner that maximizes the services provided to justice users in Texas.

*Objectives*

Enhance existing law enforcement and corrections information systems to allow them to take advantage of newer technologies.

Ensure that justice information is available to justice system entities that need it.

Gain support of local agencies so that they provide data in a timely, accurate manner, thereby ensuring that the best possible information is available to the justice community.

## **Vermont**

### ***Vermont Criminal Justice Integration Services (CJIS)***

#### *Governance: Steering Committee*

A Steering Committee with leaders from Corrections, Public Safety, State Attorneys, the CIO and Courts sets policies and establishes priorities. A Technical Committee with broad representation from all stakeholders reviews technology alternatives and recommends projects and priorities to The Steering Committee. The Department of Public Safety provides a process interface to local law enforcement agencies. The Office of the CIO coordinates efforts at the Steering Committee level and the CJIS Coordinator reports to the CIO. We will be developing additional interfaces to local agencies such as fire departments and other first responders as well as additional State agencies such as The Department of Motor Vehicles and Social service agencies. Technical Subcommittee: explore, analyze and recommend tactical solutions to the Steering Committee. DPS Users Group: provide input to DPS for local requirements.

Administration Department	Office of the CIO
Corrections	Department of Corrections
Jail Management	Sheriff's Offices
Prosecution	State Attorney's Offices
State Court Administration	Office of the State Court Administrator
State Courts	State Supreme Court
State Law Enforcement	Department of Public Safety

#### *Mission*

The goal of a Criminal Justice Integration System (CJIS) is to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of all agencies and branches of state government in the delivery of criminal justice services to Vermonters through timely sharing of data between agencies and branches. A key benefit of integration is improved decision making. This includes better information for law enforcement officers at the points of critical decisions, better information for improved court management and case-related decisions, more complete information for prosecution and defense attorneys, and comprehensive data for corrections officials to make appropriate classification and assignment decisions.

#### *Vision*

Our future vision for criminal justice integration is one where law enforcement officers throughout the state have access from their vehicles to state and federal databases that provide them with the information they need to perform their duties more efficiently and safely. The officer's ability to make situational assessments will be improved because s/he will have access to warrants, outstanding relief from abuse orders, conditions of parole or release and mug shots from criminal records repositories in Vermont and other states via the FBI, INS and other federal sources. The officer will have a global positioning device to allow for crime mapping and sharing of positional information with other interested parties such as state and federal highway accident reporting programs who use this data to target road improvements. If the officer makes an arrest, the information s/he enters will be sent over secure computer networks to the State Attorney's case management computer system. Pertinent information from the arrest record will also be shared with the Office of the Defender General and sent to the Vermont Crime Information Center (VCIC) to begin to write the criminal record. The State Attorney will prosecute the case by electronically filing with the Courts, using a common data dictionary to describe the criminal offense. This dictionary will be used by all criminal justice agencies in the state and will be updated as national standards are adopted. The Courts will electronically notify all parties of hearing dates and when the hearing takes place, the judge will



have on line access to the defendant's records including the arrest record and any outstanding warrants. If the defendant is a repeat offender, the judge may also electronically receive any past violations of parole, and personal incarceration history from the Department of Corrections. As the hearing or trial progresses, and preliminary and final judgments occur, they will be electronically sent to VCIC for updating the criminal record. The judge electronically signs other criminal justice documents such as relief from abuse orders, violations of probation or conditions of parole, warrants and sex offender registry information. These items are immediately available to law enforcement agencies and become part of the criminal record. If the offender is to be incarcerated the mittimus with charge and sentencing information will be sent electronically to the Department of Corrections (DOC) for them to create or add on to the offender's corrections record. If the offender is sentenced to community service the electronic record will be sent to the appropriate parole board. DOC will electronically update and share the prisoner records with local and federal agencies such as Social Service agencies for child protection and child support, the IRS and others.

In all cases data will be entered only once by the authoritative source. Law enforcement for the police record, State Attorneys for the prosecution, Courts for judgments and Corrections for prisoners or parolees.

#### *Objectives*

Initially our plan is to establish a uniformly secure environment on a statewide basis to serve as a foundation for sharing information. We are promoting standards that will ease integration which will be considered at all levels when systems are purchased or upgraded. Our initial plan is to work with State Attorneys and Sheriffs to implement a case management system using a statewide data dictionary of criminal offenses. This development will enable further integration developments from law enforcement and to the courts. As XML standards develop for courts and criminal justice, they will be implemented into our system. Perhaps our most important strategic objective is to aggressively pursue all funding sources. Integration efforts in other states show this as a key area. We need to work to educate members of our own legislature on the importance and benefits of integration.

Provide decision support information on a timely basis to increase the quality and speed of decisions made in the criminal justice system and to reduce duplicate entries of information and improve security throughout the system.

### **Virginia**

#### ***Virginia Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (ICJIS)***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Services Board

Current policy oversight provided by Criminal Justice Services Board, whose members are appointed by the Governor. A new Policy Oversight Committee may be established in the future. All of the major state criminal justice agencies are represented on the Board. In addition, the Board contains representatives from local criminal justice entities. The Criminal Justice Services Board (CJSB) was created by legislation that took effect July 1, 1982. The CJSB has many other responsibilities besides the policy oversight for ICJIS. It was not created specifically for the purpose of governing ICJIS.

Compensation Board	State Compensation Board
Corrections	Department of Corrections
Criminal Justice Services	Department of Criminal Justice Services
Department of Motor Vehicles	Division of Motor Vehicles
Juvenile Justice	Department of Juvenile Justice
State Courts	Supreme Court of Virginia
State Law Enforcement	Department of State Police

*Charter:* Virginia Code § 9-168

Criminal Justice Services Board, Committee on Training, and Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice established; appointment; terms; vacancies; members not disqualified from holding other offices; designation of chairmen; expenses; meetings

A. There is hereby created the Criminal Justice Services Board. The Board shall be composed of twenty-seven members as set out below. Eight members of the Board shall be as follows: the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Virginia, or his designee; the Attorney General of Virginia, or his designee; the Superintendent of the Department of State Police; the Director of the Department of Corrections; the Director of the Department of Juvenile Justice; the Superintendent of the Department of Correctional Education; the Chairman of the Parole Board; and the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court of Virginia. In those instances in which the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court of Virginia, the Superintendent of the Department of State Police, the Director of the Department of Corrections, the Director of the Department of Juvenile Justice, the Superintendent of the Department of Correctional Education, or the Chairman of the Parole Board will be unavoidably absent from a board meeting, he may appoint a member of his staff to represent him at the meeting.

Fifteen members shall be appointed by the Governor from among residents of this Commonwealth. At least one shall be a representative of a crime victims' organization or a victim of crime as defined in subsection B of § 19.2-11.01. The remainder shall be representative of the broad categories of state and local governments, criminal justice systems, and law-enforcement agencies, including but not limited to, police officials, sheriffs, attorneys for the Commonwealth, defense counsel, the judiciary, correctional and rehabilitative activities, and other locally elected and appointed administrative and legislative officials. Among these members there shall be two sheriffs representing the Virginia State Sheriffs Association selected from among names submitted by the Association; two representatives of the Chiefs of Police Association selected from among names submitted by the Association; one attorney for the Commonwealth selected from among names submitted by the Association for Commonwealth's Attorneys; one person who is a mayor, city or town manager, or member of a city or town council representing the Virginia Municipal League selected from among names submitted by the League; one person who is a county executive, manager, or member of a county board of supervisors representing the Virginia Association of Counties selected from among names submitted by the Association; one member representing the Virginia Crime Prevention Association selected from among names submitted by the Association; one member of the Private Security Services Advisory Board; and one representative of the Virginia Association of Regional Jail Superintendents selected from among names submitted by the Association.

Four members of the Board shall be members of the General Assembly appointed by the chairmen of legislative committees as follows: one member of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Delegates; one member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate; one member of the Committee for Courts of Justice of the House of Delegates, and one member of the Committee for Courts of Justice of the Senate. The legislative members shall serve for the terms for which they were elected and shall serve as ex officio members without a vote.

B. There is further created a permanent Committee on Training under the Board which shall be the policy-making body responsible to the Board for effecting the provisions of subdivisions 2 through 12 of § 9-170. The Committee on Training shall be composed of thirteen members of the Board as follows: the Superintendent of the Department of State Police; the Director of the Department of Corrections; the member of the Private Security Services Advisory Board; the Executive Secretary of the Supreme Court of Virginia; the two sheriffs representing the Virginia State Sheriffs Association; the two representatives of the Chiefs of Police Association; the attorney for the Commonwealth representing the Association for Attorneys for the Commonwealth; the representative of the Virginia Municipal League; the representative of the Virginia Association of Counties; the regional jail superintendent representing the Virginia Association of Regional Jails; and one member designated by the Chairman of the Board from among the other appointments made by the Governor. The Committee on Training shall annually elect its chairman from among its members.

C. There is further created a permanent Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice which shall have the responsibility for advising and assisting the Board, the Department, all agencies, departments, boards and institutions of the Commonwealth, and units of general local government, or combinations thereof, on matters related to the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency and the administration of juvenile justice in the Commonwealth. The Advisory Committee shall consist of no less than fifteen and no more than twenty-five members. The membership of the Advisory Committee shall include persons who have training, experience or special knowledge concerning the prevention and treatment of juvenile delinquency or the administration of juvenile justice as set out below. Four ex officio members with voting powers of

the Advisory Committee shall be as follows: the Commissioner of the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services; the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services; the Director of the Department of Juvenile Justice; and the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Two members shall be members from the General Assembly, appointed by the chairmen of the following legislative committees: one member of the Senate Committee for Courts of Justice and one member of the House Committee on Health, Welfare and Institutions. The legislative members shall serve as ex officio members for the terms for which they were elected. All other members shall be residents of the Commonwealth and be appointed by the Governor for a term of four years, except that appointments to terms commencing on July 1, 1991, shall be as outlined below. Five members, appointed for four-year terms, shall include: two members from the Criminal Justice Services Board; one member with expertise in juvenile services; one member representing community-based delinquency prevention or treatment programs; and one member who is under the age of twenty-four at the time of appointment. Six members shall be appointed for three-year terms and shall include one juvenile and domestic relations district court judge; one member who is a representative of local law enforcement; one member who is a local city or county administrator; one member who is a member of the Virginia State Bar; and two members who are under the age of twenty-four at the time of appointment. Six members, appointed for two-year terms, shall include one member who is employed in a private organization with a special focus on maintaining and strengthening the family unit; one member who works as a volunteer with delinquents or potential delinquents; one member who is now or formerly has been under the jurisdiction of the Virginia juvenile justice system; one member who is an employee of a local juvenile and domestic relations district court service unit; one member who is a representative of business groups or businesses employing youth; and one member who represents organizations concerned with the quality of juvenile justice, education or social services for children. The majority of the Advisory Committee shall be private citizens and at least three members of the Advisory Committee, including two private citizens shall also be members of the Board. The Advisory Committee shall elect its chairman from among its members. The Advisory Committee shall have the following specific duties and responsibilities:

1. To review the operation of the juvenile justice system in the Commonwealth, including facilities and programs, and prepare appropriate reports;
2. To review statewide plans, conduct studies, and make recommendations on needs and priorities for the development and improvement of the juvenile justice system in the Commonwealth; and
3. To advise on all matters related to the federal Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-415, as amended), and recommend such actions on behalf of the Commonwealth as may seem desirable to secure benefits of that or other federal programs for delinquency prevention or the administration of juvenile justice.

Each administrative entity or collegial body within the executive branch of the state government as may be requested to do so shall cooperate with the Advisory Committee as it carries out its responsibilities.

D. The members of the Board and Advisory Committee appointed by the Governor shall serve for terms of four years, provided that no member shall serve beyond the time when he holds the office or employment by reason of which he was initially eligible for appointment. Appointed members of the Board and Advisory Committee shall not be eligible to serve as such for more than two consecutive full terms. Three or more years within a four-year period shall be deemed a full term. Any vacancy on the Board and Advisory Committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment, but for the unexpired term.

E. The Governor shall appoint a Chairman of the Board, and the Board shall designate one or more vice-chairmen from among its members, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

F. Notwithstanding any provision of any statute, ordinance, local law, or charter provision to the contrary, membership on the Board shall not disqualify any member from holding any other public office or employment, or cause the forfeiture thereof.

G. Members of the Board and Advisory Committee shall be entitled to receive reimbursement for any actual expenses incurred as a necessary incident to such service and to receive such compensation as is provided in § 2.1-20.3.

H. The Board and Advisory Committee shall each hold no less than four regular meetings a year. Subject to the requirements of this subsection, the respective Chairman shall fix the times and places of meetings, either on his own motion or upon written request of any five members of the Board or Advisory Committee.

I. The Board and Advisory Committee may adopt bylaws for their operation.

#### *Mission*

The ultimate goal of the Virginia Integrated Criminal Justice Information System (ICJIS) is to promote public safety by providing people who work in the criminal justice community with whatever information they need to do their jobs, when they need it, and where they need it.

### **Washington**

#### ***Seattle Justice Information System (SeaJIS)***

*Governance:* Law, Safety & Justice IT Committee (LSJITC)

Fire Department	Seattle Fire Department
Local Courts	Municipal Court of Seattle
Local Law Enforcement	Seattle Police Department
Prosecution	Seattle Law Department
Technology Office	Department of Information Technology

*Charter:* City Ordinance and CTO

#### *Mission*

To provide integrated, comprehensive, and secure technology to support our employees in delivering the best possible services to all of our communities.

#### *Vision*

Seattle will be a national model for law, safety and justice information technology systems.

#### *Objectives*

Reduce redundant data preparation and entry activities.

Provide timely and comprehensive data to all decision-makers who need it.

Create an architecture that will allow Seattle to take advantage of shared solutions and future technology enhancements.

#### ***Washington Justice Information Network (JIN)***

*Governance:* Justice Information Committee (policy level)

The Justice Information Committee, which is a sub-committee of the statutory Information Services Board (ISB), is responsible for setting policy. The Criminal Justice Information Act (CJIA) Executive Committee, however, provides operational oversight for JIC initiatives and has statutory responsibility for developing and implementing recommendations regarding justice information system improvements. Committees: Data Standards sub-committee, Livescan sub-committee, and JIN Cost Recovery sub-committee.

Association of Cities	Association of Washington Cities
Clerk of Court	State Association of County Clerks
Corrections	State Department of Corrections
Financial Office	State Office of Financial Management
Information Services	State Department of Information Services

Information System	Association of County and City Information Systems
Juvenile Justice	State Juvenile Rehabilitation Administration
Licensing	State Department of Licensing
Local Courts	District and Municipal Court Judges Association
Local Courts	Superior Court Judges Association
Local Government	State Association of Counties
Local Law Enforcement	State Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs
Prosecution	State Office of the Attorney General
Prosecution	State Association of Prosecuting Attorneys
Public Safety	King County Law, Safety and Justice Committee
Sentencing Commission	Sentencing Guidelines Commission
State Court Administration	Office of the Administrator of the Courts
State Law Enforcement	State Patrol

*Charter:* Revised Code of Washington 10.98.160

Procedures, development considerations-- Executive committee, review and recommendations. In the development and modification of the procedures, definitions, and reporting capabilities of the section, the department, the office of financial management, and the responsible agencies and persons shall consider the needs of other criminal justice agencies such as the administrator for the courts, local law enforcement agencies, jailers, the sentencing guidelines commission, the \*board of prison terms and paroles, the clemency board, prosecuting attorneys, and affected state agencies such as the office of financial management and legislative committees dealing with criminal justice issues. An executive committee appointed by the heads of the department, the Washington state patrol, and the office of financial management shall review and provide recommendations for development and modification of the section, the department, and the office of financial management's felony criminal information systems. [1987 c 462 § 5; 1984 c 17 § 16.]

#### *Mission*

The mission of the Justice Information Network (JIN) is to ensure that any criminal justice practitioner in the state will have complete, timely, and accurate information about any suspect or offender. This information will include identity, criminal history and current justice status; will come from data that have been entered once; and will be available on a single workstation with a single network connection from an automated statewide system. This system and the services it provides will be known as the Justice Information Network.

#### *Vision*

The vision of the Justice Information Network is to provide complete, accurate and timely information about any suspect or offender. Information made available anytime, anywhere to help the justice community to make informed decisions when they are needed to move cases quickly and fairly through the justice enterprise.

#### *Objectives*

Complete, timely and accurate information about any suspect or offender to include identity, criminal history and current justice status.

Information will be available from a single computer terminal, with a single network connection.

Information will be entered only once (eliminating redundant data entry).

A secure network for all JIN transactions.

Justice partners will be able to maintain legacy databases and will share only information that has been agreed upon.

All information will be maintained using Internet Standard Based Protocol.

As information is transmitted from one agency to another, additional data will add value to the information received.

Information that will be used to make decision making easier and informed.

A minimal of impact on legacy databases.

A cost-effective, robust, secure network.

## **Washington, D.C.**

### ***JUSTIS***

*Governance:* Criminal Justice Coordinating Council

The Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) draws upon local and federal agencies and individuals to develop recommendations and strategies for accomplishing its mission. Its guiding principles are creative collaboration, community involvement, and effective resource utilization. The CJCC is committed to developing targeted funding strategies and comprehensive management information through integrated information technology systems and social science research in order to achieve its goal. Privacy & Security Working Group: formulate a plan of action for incorporation of security and privacy into the Justice Information System environment. Technical Working Group: recommend the design and implementation of an infrastructure solution that is effective and efficient and provides flexibility while meeting the needs of the DC justice community. Analysis & Design Working Group: identify agency data access opportunities, define basic notification functions, establish the long-term development of justice data standards, and examine the potential for interagency data transfer.

Clerk of Court	Clerk of Court
Corrections	District of Columbia Corrections Trustee
Corrections	Federal Bureau of Prisons
Financial Office	District of Columbia
	Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority
Information Services	Chief Technology Officer for the District of Columbia
Jail Management	District of Columbia Department of Corrections
Juvenile Justice	Department of Human Services' Youth Services Administration
Mayor's Office	Mayor's Office
Parole	United States Parole Commission
Pre-trial Services	Pretrial Services Agency
Probation Department	Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency
Prosecution	United States Attorney for the District of Columbia
Prosecution	Office of Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia
Public Defense	Public Defender Service of the District of Columbia
State Courts	Superior Court for the District of Columbia
State Law Enforcement	Metropolitan Police Department

*Charter:* Interagency Agreement on Information Technology

<http://www.cjccdc.org/agreement.htm?KeyID=63>

### *Mission*

**CJCC Mission:** The mission of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council (CJCC) is to serve as the forum for identifying issues and their solutions, proposing actions, and facilitating cooperation that will improve public safety and the related criminal and juvenile justice services for District of Columbia residents, visitors, victims, and offenders.

**ITAC Mission:** The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) shall advise and recommend on matters pertaining to the funding, development, operation, maintenance and monitoring of a Justice Information System to improve public safety and the related criminal and juvenile justice services for the District of Columbia residents, visitors, victims and offenders.

### *Vision*

To better serve the administration of justice in the District of Columbia by using the best available technology to share information which can be shared in the most effective manner.

### *Objectives*

The agreed objective is to share information which can be shared with as little difficulty and duplication of input as possible. The District of Columbia is seeking to implement a highly secure integrated criminal justice solution that:

- Increases efficiency without impacting existing operations;
- Provides critical information in a timely manner;
- Ensures the autonomy and jurisdiction of the participating agencies;
- Leverages existing Criminal Justice Coordinating Council and District work products to date; and
- Provides the desired benefits as quickly and cost effectively as possible.

## **Wisconsin**

### ***Wisconsin Justice Information Sharing (WIJIS) Project***

**Governance:** Wisconsin Justice Information Sharing (WIJIS) Workgroup

The WIJIS Workgroup is a broad-based voluntary group supported by the Bureau of Justice Information Systems as the organization with statutory responsibility for the promotion and facilitation of justice information sharing for the State of Wisconsin. It was established by BJIS under authority established in § 16.971(9) Wis. Stats. The WIJIS Workgroup meets monthly to share information, identify projects and plan for the future. The group was first convened in 1997, and it was used as the foundation of a successful Y2K Public Safety Team formed to address state and local Y2K issues. The group is establishing itself as the link between state enterprise technology projects and the justice community. BJIS itself serves as a state resource for local and regional information sharing efforts as well as the operational support unit for statewide prosecutor technology. Membership is open with 26 state and local members currently on the roster. Group members include: 1) technology professionals supporting justice programs; 2) justice professionals such as law enforcement officers, prosecutors, clerks of court and others; and, 3) representatives of funding entities. Currently, at least seventeen (17) state and local justice and related agencies participate on the workgroup. In addition, several sub-committees work on technical or related projects. WIJIS Data Transport Sub-Committee: define technical details and operationalize transport standard adopted for state-level justice data exchanges, involving use of XML, STEP, and SOAP. Information Exchange Points Sub-Committee(s): enter and validate data compiled in SEARCH information exchange data collection tool. WIJIS Portal Sub-Committee: track the State's portal project and serve as liaison between portal and WIJIS initiatives.

Administration Department	Bureau of Justice Information Systems (BJIS)
Clerk of Court	Dane County Clerk of Courts
Corrections	Department of Corrections
Governor's Office	Governor's Office

Justice Department	Crime Information Bureau, Department of Justice
Local Courts	Waukesha County Courts
Local Law Enforcement	Dane County Sheriff's Office
Local Law Enforcement	Madison Police Department
Other	State Budget Office
Other	Milwaukee HITDA
Other	Office of Justice Assistance
Prosecution	Waukesha County District Attorney Office
Prosecution	Manitowoc District Attorney Office
Prosecution	Dane County District Attorney Office
Prosecution	Wisconsin District Attorney Association
Public Defense	Office of the State Public Defender
State Court Administration	Consolidated Court Automation Program
	Director of State Courts Office
State Courts	Division of Hearings and Appeals
Transportation	Department of Transportation
	Bureau of Automation Services (State Patrol, DMV)

*Charter:* § 16.971(9) Wis. Stats.

(9) In conjunction with the public defender board, the director of state courts, the departments of corrections and justice and district attorneys, the division may maintain, promote and coordinate automated justice information systems that are compatible among counties and the officers and agencies specified in this subsection, using the moneys appropriated under § 20.505 (1) (ja), (kp) and (kq). The division shall annually report to the legislature under § 13.172 (2) concerning the division's efforts to improve and increase the efficiency of integration of justice information systems.

#### *Mission*

The mission of the WIJIS workgroup is to enhance the operating efficiencies of each of the individual justice partner organizations for the improvement of justice administration through electronic sharing of information.

#### *Vision*

The WIJIS vision for the administration of justice in Wisconsin is that together the systems of the justice partners will comprise a framework that provides real-time access to and exchange of complete and accurate justice information.

#### *Objectives*

Promote information sharing among Wisconsin's justice agencies.

Assure protection of public safety.

Allow justice agencies to run more effectively and efficiently.

Prevent vital justice information from falling through the cracks.

## **Wyoming**

### ***Wyoming Judicial Technology Initiative***

*Governance:* Judicial Technology Task Force (JTTF)



Clerk of Court	Court Clerks
Information Technology	Information Technology Managers
Judicial	Judges
Local Law Enforcement	Local Law Enforcement
Private Attorneys	Private Attorneys
Public	Public
State Law Enforcement	State Law Enforcement

*Charter:* State Supreme Court

*Objectives*

Goal 1. Improve our work processes

Objective 1) Promote sharing of resources with and between state and local agencies and the private sector to avoid duplication and waste.

Objective 2) Identify new high leverage opportunities to improve the justice system & pilot projects to demonstrate the capability.

Objective 3) Develop a web-accessible facility to increase visibility into initiatives, pilot projects, best practices and related information technology programs statewide.

Goal 2. Enhance communications among courts and justice system agencies

Objective 4) Develop minimum standards for voice, video, and data services shared by the justice system.

Objective 5) Develop the communications infrastructure necessary for efficient and effective linking of all courts in the state.

Objective 6) Develop minimum standards for a statewide justice system "intranet".

Goal 3. Increase public access to court services

Objective 7) Develop security guidelines for controlling access to and protecting the integrity and confidentiality of information available in electronic form.

Objective 8) Develop a justice system Web page for public access for reasonable fees as set by the JPC.

**Appendix E:  
The Justice Information  
Exchange Model (JIEM)**

## The Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM)

### *I. Background*

Integration is the electronic exchange of information between justice agencies at the local, state, and national levels. It is more than the ability to inquire into the databases of other organizations, although that is an important component. True integration implies computer-to-computer transmission of operational data with little or no human intervention. It also includes automatic notification of appropriate individuals when certain events occur, for example, immediately notifying prosecutors, judges, or probation officers of the re-arrest of an offender whom they are monitoring.

SEARCH, The National Consortium for Justice Information and Statistics, initiated the Justice Information Exchange Model project to support the integration of justice information systems. In conducting the initial phases of this research project, which is funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, SEARCH accomplished these five objectives:

1. Developed a model for analyzing criminal justice information exchange;
2. Implemented the model in a software tool to collect, document, analyze, and portray graphically data about criminal justice information flow and business processes;
3. Collected detailed information about criminal justice information exchange in five states;
4. Provided graphic, tabular, and narrative information to the participating states about their criminal justice information exchange for input into integrated system design; and
5. Analyzed similarities and differences between states to increase the understanding of how the criminal justice system operates, which will make future integration efforts — and the development of national standards — easier, faster, cheaper, and more effective.

Paper-based information exchange has been an inherent part of criminal justice operations as long as the justice system has existed, that is, local law enforcement sends a citation to the prosecutor's office, the prosecutor files a charging document with the court, and the court sends the final disposition to the state criminal history repository. Automation enabled criminal justice organizations and agencies to decrease internal reliance on paper. Integration, meanwhile, seeks to automate the exchange of information between organizations in a similar way, reducing the cost and increasing the completeness, accuracy, and timeliness of data exchange. While many states and local criminal justice systems have developed some custom electronic interfaces to replace individual paper transactions, integration addresses the full range of enterprise communications

with a single, broad strategy. Of course, as integration becomes more widespread, it also will be feasible and economical to exchange additional information and to include agencies that never received the paper records in the past, thus enhancing the effectiveness of the justice system.

#### *The Justice Information Exchange Model*

With the assistance of five pilot states, SEARCH developed the Justice Information Exchange Model (JIEM), which consists of five universal dimensions:

1. Process – the stage of a given subject’s case as he or she moves through the criminal justice system, for example, investigation, detention, pre-disposition supervision;
2. Event – the decision point that triggers the exchange of information between two or more agencies or entities, for example, arrest, disposition, sentencing hearing;
3. Agency – the entity that sends and receives justice information, for example, city law enforcement agency, prosecutor’s office, trial court;
4. Conditions – factors that determine the flow and content of information exchange, for example, if the arrestee is an adult or a juvenile, if the suspect is in custody; and
5. Information – the paper-based or electronic information that is exchanged between the agencies, including specific documents, data sets (groups of logically related data elements), and individual data elements.

To understand information exchange in the context of the JIEM, consider the following example:

When a local law enforcement agency arrests a subject who is over 18 years of age and takes that subject into custody, it sends an arrest report to the prosecutor’s office so the prosecutor may determine whether or not to file charges with the court.

This exchange is parsed into the five dimensions of the model, some of which occur at both the sending and receiving ends of the transaction, as shown in the Arrest Report example below. Of course, the Arrest Report document consists of a number of data elements that are organized into data sets, which are not shown in detail in this example.

Dimensions of Justice Information Exchange	Arrest Report Example
Prevailing Process	Investigation

Initiating Event	Arrest
Sending Agency	A local law enforcement agency
Conditions	If subject is over 18 years of age and If subject is taken into custody
Document	Arrest Report
Recipient Agency	Prosecutor's Office
Prevailing Process	Investigation
Subsequent Event	Prosecution Charging Decision

The initiating event, the Arrest, may spawn additional exchanges. For instance, local law enforcement also may send a Booking Report to the jail for use in the booking process. Therefore, events may trigger one or more exchanges, depending on the nature of the event and the conditions that are in effect.

Once the prosecutor receives the Arrest Report, he or she must determine whether to file charges. The subsequent event, Prosecution Charging Decision, becomes the initiating event for later exchanges. Defining these subsequent events allows for the tracking of process flow information throughout the criminal justice system.

#### *The Justice Information Exchange Modeling Tool*

The JIEM Modeling Tool, a software package developed by SEARCH that implements the JIEM, was used by five pilot states during the initial phase of the Information Exchange Project. These states were Colorado, Kansas, Minnesota, New Mexico, and Pennsylvania. Since the completion of the first phase of the project, other states also have used the JIEM Modeling Tool to understand criminal justice information flow and to prepare for greater integration of their systems. The software has undergone numerous refinements and enhancements, and more changes are expected as the project continues.

The JIEM Modeling Tool provides a Web-based user interface, business logic, and relational database designed to document information flow and business rules in criminal justice operational processes. In using the Tool, representatives of justice system organizations discuss and analyze current data flow within their operations and enter specific information about each exchange. Once the data about all of the exchanges are entered into the modeling tool, it is possible to generate tabular and graphical reports that help criminal justice leaders understand how their system works at a level of detail far greater than was known — or possible — before. This information can be used to identify redundancy, bottlenecks, and opportunities to improve justice system work flow. It also identifies the individual exchanges that should be the highest priority for automation and provides critical information for design of the interfaces.

The Justice Information Exchange Modeling Tool is complex to use and requires

consistency between users and between states in how information is entered. If consistency of use does not occur within a state, then the reports and charts that are generated will not be meaningful and may add confusion, rather than clarity, to the integration project. If consistency of use does not occur between states, then reports may not function correctly and the ability to analyze criminal justice information flow at a higher level may be compromised. This, in turn, will impede efforts to develop national models and standards that one day can lead to cheaper, more effective off-the-shelf software products for justice system organizations.

Participants in the SEARCH Justice Information Exchange Project are not required to purchase hardware or software licenses in order to use the modeling tool. SEARCH provides the free software via an online download process, and also provides training and technical assistance at no charge. Though a considerable investment of staff time is required, participating states receive a wealth of information in the form of charts, reports, and diagrams, to assist them in their integration efforts. In return, the site is asked only to use the modeling tool in a manner that is consistent with other states, to support the national scope objectives of the project.

### *The Importance of Analyzing Business Processes*

SEARCH believes that in order to implement a viable technological solution for integrated justice, each site must first identify and understand its business processes. Ms. Catherine Plummer, former Project Manager of New Mexico's Justice Information Sharing Project, expressed this view as follows,

“The foundation of your architecture has to be the business process review, and the JIEM provides the framework for that review.”

The objective, therefore, is to document business processes in order to develop a roadmap for integrated justice implementation.

The JIEM Modeling Tool was designed specifically for the analysis and documentation of justice system information flow and business processes. It enables justice system practitioners to systematically decompose complex transactions and activities, using a common format and language. The modeling tool, however, only can succeed if all organizations that are a part of the criminal justice process are represented by knowledgeable and committed subject-matter experts who have sufficient time and resources to complete the task.

The JIEM Modeling Tool provides enhanced reporting capabilities that allow users to view their documentation from various perspectives. After defining the full list of exchanges, users may view information exchanges that involve selected documents (for example, arrest report, criminal complaint, court order), that occur between specific agencies (for example, from prosecutor's office to court, from

court to state repository, or from law enforcement to all other agencies), and that arise during particular events (for example, arrest, sentence hearing, prison discharge). These reports may be viewed as text files — available in HTML documents or Microsoft Excel spreadsheets — or as system-generated flowcharts.

## ***II. Getting Started***

### ***Preliminary Requirements and SEARCH's Role***

The JIEM Modeling Tool can assist those responsible for state and local integration projects in many ways. In fact, jurisdictions that are in the planning stages of an automation project can even use it to ensure that the internal systems that they create or purchase will be compatible with the integration needs of the justice system as a whole. But the jurisdiction's integration initiative first must be at a certain stage of progress before use of the modeling tool is appropriate. At a minimum, the state or local project must have a governance structure in place and functioning, with the necessary executive commitment and support from each of the key organizations. Operational requirements must have been defined and a strategic plan must be in place to ensure that there is consensus and a shared vision as to what the project is intended to accomplish. In addition, each agency must be prepared to dedicate key staff to a process that will take months to complete.

Jurisdictions seeking to participate in the Justice Information Exchange Model project do not need to purchase software licenses to operate the JIEM Modeling Tool. All that is needed is a desktop computer with Internet access.

Jurisdictions may begin using the application with no direct hardware or software application expenditures, assuming that they have Internet access through a personal computer. The personnel who are assigned to the project simply access the modeling tool via their Web browsers, which causes the free Java application to be loaded on their computer.

SEARCH acts as the Application Service Provider (ASP) by maintaining the application on a server in-house, monitoring data entry, and providing back-up procedures to protect users' data.

SEARCH oversees access rights and assigns one person in each jurisdiction as the System Administrator. This person ensures that only authorized users have access to the JIEM Modeling Tool. Multiple users may access the software concurrently from their workstations.

SEARCH provides technical assistance to introduce the project methodology to a wide array of criminal justice representatives, to ensure that key users are trained on the application, and to assist in preliminary data collection efforts.

Sites must identify a contact person to coordinate technical assistance visits. This person is responsible for identifying the justice system representatives who need

training in the JIEM methodology and the software application. This person eventually will train and assist others.

#### *Experience of Development Sites*

Working with the original five sites and numerous other jurisdictions has yielded important lessons regarding participation in the project that can assist new jurisdictions just starting out.

*Best results are achieved when a broad cross-section of justice practitioners define information flow and business processes.*

Jurisdictions using the Justice Integration Exchange Model and modeling tool have created user groups to identify information exchange points. These groups are comprised of practitioners with extensive business flow knowledge, and are generally split into teams from related disciplines or by stages of the case (for example, agencies that share information during the pre-disposition court stage). For instance, law enforcement, prosecutor, and court personnel may meet in one group to work on specific exchanges in which they participate, while probation, parole, and correctional personnel meet in another. Subsequently, members of these two groups are brought together to discuss their findings. Similarly, other meetings may require a mingling of personnel from each group.

Once sufficient progress has been made, other criminal justice personnel may be tasked to validate data entry. This may result in more meetings to determine if additional exchanges should be documented. Several reviews may be necessary to ensure that information exchanges are documented accurately and completely.

*Dedicated project staff should be assigned to oversee data collection efforts.*

While hardware and software costs may be negligible, participation in the project requires substantial commitment of personnel resources by justice organizations. Project staff members, who work outside the boundaries of a single justice agency, oversee documentation efforts, and facilitate information gathering sessions, also are an essential component. Project staff should coordinate meetings of business workgroups to define information-sharing needs. These sessions may last several months, and project staff must define project objectives, deliverables, and reasonable timelines to ensure success.

*Meetings should be held regularly, kept short, and facilitated by proficient users of the JIEM.*

Meetings should be held once a week to maintain momentum, to keep issues fresh in participants' minds, and to provide consistency. If too much time passes between meetings, users shift focus to other priorities. Also, because these sessions are intense and complicated, meetings should be limited to two- to three-hours. Longer sessions tend to yield negative returns.

In addition, a facilitator should enter exchanges into the modeling tool as



practitioners describe their information-sharing needs. This facilitator, preferably a project staff member, should be adept in use of the application to ensure quality data entry. This person should have sufficient business knowledge of the justice system to prompt users about potential exchanges, maintain focus on project scope, and limit confusion.

*Statewide efforts should involve local justice practitioners.*

It is critical that at least some local users be involved in statewide integration projects, because of the large volume of information exchange that occurs at the local level. In each of the original project sites, several county representatives assisted with information collection. While the participation of a few representative counties may not necessarily reflect the information sharing practices of every county in the state, it ensures that most of the differences are discussed and taken into account.

*Initial efforts should document current, not future, information-sharing practices.*

In each of the original sites, users first identified exchanges as they were occurring at the time of the meetings, not as they should occur following integration. It is important to identify and document what works and what does not work, before designing a new system. Looking to future methods of information sharing tends to complicate discussions because it raises technological issues prematurely. Again, technology should be discussed after business processes are well understood.

*Initially, users should discuss information flow at the document level.*

Exchanges should initially be analyzed at the document level, not at the data set and data element level. The objective is first to identify the documents (or equivalent electronic transactions) exchanged during key events. Once that work is complete, details of specific data sets and data elements that are contained on those documents can be added. This approach has been taken in each of the original sites and proved to be the most practical and efficient approach.

*Value of the Data Collection Tool*

The Justice Information Exchange Model and the modeling tool assist the integration project team in many ways, such as:

*Methodology provides framework for discussions.*

The JIEM Modeling Tool allows criminal justice practitioners to adopt an enterprise view of information sharing and provides a common framework for the discussion of integrated justice information exchange. Often, justice officials have a strong sense of their particular agency's information needs, but not the needs of other agencies. Through use of the software package, inefficiencies in current information-sharing practices can be readily identified, discussed, and corrected.

*Reports allow users to view information exchanges from various perspectives.*

As discussed previously, system reports provide users with various views of their identified information exchanges. They allow users to track information that is of particular importance to them, which then may be used in a multitude of ways. For instance, in New Mexico, Ms. Catherine Plummer observed that the prosecutors' offices were responsible for a large proportion of the overall documented exchanges. Using project data, she testified before the state legislature in support of a funding request made by the Administrative Office of the District Attorneys.

In Wisconsin, the Dane County Sheriff's Office and the Dane County District Attorney's Office discovered that there was an account number that they had been capturing on one of their booking sheets that no one was using. Everyone was elated to have one less piece of information to enter and track. Ms. Bonnie Locke, Wisconsin Integrated Justice Information System (WIJIS) Director, observed:

"The dialog that results from talking about your information exchanges, what data you exchange, who receives and sends that information and why ... has been invaluable."

*Visual and text-based reports may be presented to integrated justice system architects as blueprints for implementation of the integrated justice system.*

On December 31, 2001, Minnesota issued its CrimNet Integration Infrastructure RFP in order to obtain a comprehensive solution for the design and implementation of its integrated justice information system. Attachment B of that RFP represents the Business Services Exchange Points, which provides a table of the 454 information exchanges that were documented over the course of their business process review.

This brings up the important question, when are all the relevant information exchanges identified? The answer is, it depends on the scope of an integrated justice effort (that is, whether the objective is to document only misdemeanor and felony adult offenses, adult and juvenile felonies, all criminal cases, etc.). Scope must be determined during strategic planning, prior to documenting business flow, so that users are better able to identify the boundaries of their work.

#### *What You Need to Do to Participate*

SEARCH has received numerous requests from both state and local jurisdictions seeking to utilize the JIEM Modeling Tool. SEARCH prioritizes assistance based on the readiness of the participating agencies and organizations, and the value they can add to the goals of the project. Some of the factors that will be

considered are:

*The existence of a governance structure that supports the jurisdiction's integrated justice efforts.*

An oversight committee tasked with planning and implementing the integrated justice system should be in place. It is preferred that this committee be established by legislation to ensure its long-term stability and authority, although other forms of charter are sometimes effective. In addition, subcommittees or workgroups should be created to assist the governing body in various aspects of the planning process. For instance, a business workgroup could analyze business issues surrounding integrated justice, while a technical committee could address technical concerns. Other subcommittees may be organized as well, but the key is to have the appropriate people assigned to the appropriate subcommittees in order to address the multitude of issues surrounding integrated justice planning and implementation.

*The existence of a strategic plan that contains a mission statement and a vision for the integrated justice information system.*

Jurisdictions that have already completed initial planning efforts will be in a better position to succeed with the JIEM Modeling Tool. Without a sense of direction for the integrated justice system, it is premature to begin documenting business and information flow. An established vision, well-defined mission statement, and identified objectives should be produced during the planning stage of the project.

*Commitment from high-level officials to the overall integrated justice project and an equally strong commitment from the user community.*

High-level officials are not responsible for documenting the business processes that exist in the justice system, but their leadership ensures that resources are allocated to properly plan and design an integrated justice system. They define the operational requirements for the integrated justice system, and their support is critical to its success. Similarly, the user community must be supportive of the integrated justice project as a whole, and, more specifically, the business flow documentation project.

*Jurisdictions seeking to develop XML (eXtensible Markup Language) schemas in order to facilitate data-sharing efforts.*

Information entered into the JIEM Modeling Tool, and the corresponding research surrounding that data, will feed national standard-setting efforts. Therefore, jurisdictions working on functional, process, data, and technical standards will be in a strong position to benefit from and aid those national efforts.

### ***III. Application Process***

#### ***Formal Request***

A jurisdiction must make a formal request to receive training from SEARCH and

to use the JIEM Modeling Tool. In order to be considered, justice system leaders must complete the Integrated Justice Information Systems Worksheet,<sup>13</sup> which may be filled out and submitted electronically or in hard copy. The worksheet is used to determine the nature of a jurisdiction's integrated justice project, the governance structure in place, the level of commitment demonstrated by criminal justice leaders, the agencies involved in the effort, and the reasons why use of the modeling tool would be useful to their efforts.

Note: The worksheet serves as your jurisdiction's formal request for participation in this project. In addition, we will use information you submit on the worksheet to post a profile of your jurisdiction's integrated justice efforts on the Integrated Justice Information Systems Website at [www.search.org/integration/](http://www.search.org/integration/). If you currently have a profile on the site, please review it to make sure that information is current. If you don't, fill out a worksheet and submit to SEARCH.

#### *Site Visit*

If a jurisdiction is selected for participation in the project, SEARCH staff will visit to explain the project in more detail. After this initial site visit, SEARCH may determine that a jurisdiction still is not prepared for training and widespread use of the software. Therefore, the initial meeting not only provides sites with an opportunity to assess the utility of the JIEM Modeling Tool, but also provides SEARCH with the chance to assess a jurisdiction's readiness to participate.

#### *Next Steps*

Once training is provided, jurisdictions must make reasonable progress in collecting and entering data into the JIEM Modeling Tool to continue using the application. SEARCH will monitor each jurisdiction's progress to ensure that efforts are moving along at a reasonable rate. If documentation efforts stall for a significant period of time, SEARCH will discontinue assistance and shift resources to other waiting jurisdictions. Therefore, it is critical that a jurisdiction accurately determines its readiness to participate in this project.

---

<sup>13</sup> The worksheet can be obtained from the SEARCH web site at <http://www.search.org>.

## **Appendix F: Integration Models**

## Integration Models

SEARCH maintains a web site that currently contains integration profiles for 42 state and 19 local integration projects. The format of the site allows state or local staff to submit a wide variety of information about their integration effort, organized in the following categories:

- System Description and Scope
  - System Description
  - Phase of Development
  - Implementation Status
  - Future Plans
  - System Scope
  - Agencies Involved
  - Strategic Plan
  - Mission Statement
  - Vision
- Governance Structure
  - Governing Body
  - Description
  - Established By
  - Legislation
  - Membership
  - Subcommittees/Working Groups
    - Name
    - Primary Task
- Funding
  - Total Funding
  - Total Implementation Cost
    - Funding
    - Year
    - Amount
- Technical Overview
  - Technical Overview
  - Models and Schematics
  - Key Technologies
  - Vendors/Consultants

- Standards/Specifics
- Security
  - Security Overview
  - Standards
- Objectives, Benefits, Lessons Learned
  - Integration Objectives
  - Benefits
  - Lessons Learned
- Project Documents
  - Document Name
- Contacts
  - Contact

The content of each of the 61 profiles on the site are the responsibility of the submitting organization and all are not complete. A few of the profiled projects do not cross the boundaries of justice system organizations and probably do not meet the definition of an integration project, nonetheless, they do provide interesting and helpful information about justice system technology.

A review of the integration profiles reveals widely varying views of what integration is and how it should be accomplished. At a high level, it is possible to categorize the approach to integration into a number of models, as listed below. These models provide an understanding of how a jurisdiction can approach the design of its own integration architecture. Some of the models listed below reflect organizational or operational aspects of a particular project; others reflect the technical approach used. None of the models shown below reflects any particular project exactly; most integration architectures use a combination of several.

A jurisdiction beginning the integration planning process should review each of the models and select the features that best fit its local environment. Many factors determine which model, or which combination of models, a jurisdiction will choose. Political factors may be a driving force. Existing technology and integration should be considered, including the maturity, functionality, and operating environment of the systems. The size and complexity of the network will dictate certain approaches, in conjunction with the geography and population distribution of the state. Volume of information flow also is a factor, along with the cost of the various approaches.

Each of the eleven models now will be presented individually.

### ***1. Anarchy Model***

The anarchy model is characterized by a lack of central planning or coordination in connecting systems. Each interface is an independent, custom interface, designed and implemented with little thought to other information exchange needs between the participating organizations, or to other agencies that may require the same information.

The anarchy model is the most costly and difficult approach and virtually guarantees that complete integration never will be achieved. Development, implementation, and

maintenance costs are the highest of any of the approaches to integration. Progress in uncoordinated custom interfaces makes future integration more difficult because so much must be reconstructed if a more uniform approach is to be adopted.

## ***2. Network Model***

The network model is simply the connection of computers that house justice applications to each other. The network model describes some of the earliest efforts to share information from disparate systems. It focuses on inquiry access, with no electronic exchange of data from one machine to another. While the network model succeeded in improving access to justice information, it does not provide most of the benefits of integration and is not considered a viable approach today.

## ***3. Centralized Model***

The centralized approach requires all justice agencies to share a single application and a common database, or at least core elements of the database. This approach eliminates many of the biggest issues in integration—disparate data formats and structure, cross-platform communication, redundant data entry and storage, etc. It tends to work best in small- to medium-sized counties or regions that are fairly isolated. It has been successfully implemented in at least one state effort and in one large metropolitan area.

There are a few problems with this approach. Data structures cannot be optimized for more than one organization. Often these systems do not meet the internal automation needs of the participating organizations; the applications focus on core, shared data, instead. Extended functionality usually must be added as an appendage to the system by each organization. In addition, there is typically little vertical integration when this model is used—the local system usually is not connected to state systems.

## ***4. Umbrella Model***

What do you do when you have a number of legacy systems that run independently? The umbrella model is a master index that contains pointers to information in these other databases. A single inquiry against this master index can locate data from a variety of sources. The FBI triple-I is good example of an umbrella system.

The umbrella model is a good method of connecting large, legacy systems at minimal expense. It is strong in providing access to information, but weak as a model for machine-to-machine data exchange.

## ***5. Warehouse Model***

Another approach to dealing with large, legacy applications is the warehouse model. Information from older systems can be copied periodically into a newer environment—a server connected to other systems using standard communication protocols. The justice organizations can continue to operate their legacy systems internally, while making information available to others on an independent platform.

Creation of a data warehouse is much less expensive than replacing an application. It can provide a robust communications capability. This model does not address data exchange, however, and an additional weakness is that information is not always current.

## ***6. Middleware Model***

When using the middleware model, justice agencies create a new system that functions as a



communications hub. This system acts as a translator, converting information from the format of the sending agency to the format of the receiving agency.

The middleware model allows justice organizations to build applications that suit their needs, without so much concern about the needs of other organizations. The middleware ensures data compatibility so long as there is good communication between justice organizations and those who maintain the middleware. If a particular agency adds a code or changes its application without informing the middleware service provider, problems with data exchange could result. Creating a middleware system is more expensive than some of the other alternatives, but provides a strong foundation for electronic data exchange.

### ***7. Statewide Model***

The statewide model focuses on the connection of state-level systems first, with local agencies being connected later. This approach is viable in states where major applications, such as in courts and prosecution, are uniformly and centrally implemented. It does not obviate the need to work with local justice organizations to create channels with them for information sharing.

### ***8. Portal Model***

The portal model implements Internet technologies to provide a common reference point for all criminal justice information. The browser is a common user interface that is easy to use and that displays all justice information in a common format. This approach works well for providing access to justice information through inquiries, but is not relevant for data exchange.

### ***9. Backbone Model***

The backbone model is an approach of supplying standards and communications infrastructure at the state level, then leaving local agencies or regional groups to work out how they will interface with the backbone. Decisions about how to supply information in the standard format are left to local justice officials. This approach may work best in large, high-volume jurisdictions with a heavy investment in pre-existing technology. The focus is on information, not on the tools used to collect and manage it.

### ***10. Messaging Model***

Another approach for providing integration services at the state level is to create a messaging architecture for use by justice organizations in communicating with each other. Messaging services can be provided using a variety of the other models listed here. Messaging can be used to for inquiry access, for data exchange, and to support subscription and notification services, where justice officials are contacted when any justice system event occurs for any individual with whom they are involved. For example, if a suspect is arrested, if he has any pending cases, is on probation, or has outstanding warrants, the appropriate prosecutor, court, probation officer, or law enforcement agency will be notified immediately. Messaging focuses on transporting data, not so much on the content of what is being moved.

### ***11. Standardized Interface Model***

This model calls for the development and publication of data and technical specifications for each information exchange between justice agencies. Each justice organization then can develop or modify applications that suit their own internal needs, but also are capable of providing data in a standard format for communication to others.

The standardized interface model provides maximum flexibility to justice system organizations. Formulating these standards, however, is a long and difficult process. Bringing systems into compliance with the standards can take many years.

**Appendix G:  
Integration Needs  
Assessment and Integration  
Readiness Assessment**

## Integration Needs Assessment

### *Survey of Justice System Decision-makers:*

The following kinds of questions could be posed to justice system officials in a survey to determine if integration of justice information is needed in the state of Idaho. The purpose is to establish the gaps between desired and actual levels of information availability and their effect on decision-making in the justice system.

*When you make a key justice decision (e.g., arrest, charging, plea offer or acceptance, bail release, adjudication, sentence, prisoner classification, probation or parole revocation), how much information do you have concerning the offender in each of the following categories listed below, from within your county, from within your state, and from other states? What is your level of confidence in the completeness, accuracy, and timeliness of this information?*

- Intelligence information
- Identity and aliases, including access to demographic information, fingerprints, mug shots, driver's license photos, images of scars, marks, tattoos, etc.
- Prior arrests—felony, misdemeanor, infraction, and juvenile
- Prior convictions—felony, misdemeanor, infraction, and juvenile
- Pending cases—felony, misdemeanor, infraction, and juvenile
- Outstanding warrants—felony, and misdemeanor
- Current supervision status—probation, parole, deferred prosecution, judgement, or sentence, etc.
- Outstanding protection from abuse, restraining, or no-contact orders
- Conditions associated with supervision, release, orders, etc.
- Sex offender or child sex offender status
- Driving record
- Weapons prohibitions

### ***Policy Group Assessment***

The following kinds of questions could be discussed by justice systems leaders participating in the integration policy group. The purpose is to establish the gaps between desired and actual levels of information availability and their effect on decision-making in the justice system.

- What percentage of arrests in the prior five years do not have dispositions attached?
- What percentage of arrests for prior five years do not have fingerprints?
- How complete is the RAP sheet for any particular offender?
- How long does it take for the identity of a subject to be established?
- How long does it take for a fingerprint card to arrive at central repository?
- How long does it take for a sentencing order to arrive at the Department of Correction? At a local jail? At a probation office?
- What significant backlogs exist in paper processing in the justice system?
- What percentage of agency resources are devoted to entering information that was received on paper from another justice organization manually into a records systems?

## Integration Readiness Assessment

The following list of questions should be discussed by the justice systems leaders participating in the integration policy group. The purpose is to establish the organizational and political environment that currently exists, and barriers it could pose to integration planning. The first step in this assessment is to create a list of all the justice system stakeholders in the state, then to answer the rest of the questions in the first section for each.

- Which justice and justice-related organizations and individuals are stakeholders in the integration initiative (e.g., law enforcement agencies, local detention facilities, juvenile detention facilities, prosecutors, public defenders, clerks, court administrators, presiding judges, probation offices, juvenile probation offices, pre-trial services groups, mental health providers, state police, highway patrol, public safety, attorney general, homeland security, appellate courts, state court administrator, corrections, youth corrections, parole, board of pardons, motor vehicle, driver's license, humans services, education)?
- Which of the leaders of these stakeholder organizations are aware of and committed to the integration project?
- Which of these organizations store key offender or case information in a case management, records management, offender tracking, or other type of electronic information system?
- Which of these organizations have their systems connected to a common network that allows them to access or exchange information with other stakeholders?
- Which of these stakeholder organizations currently share information electronically with others?
- Which of these stakeholder organizations have technology staff that could assist in integration projects?

Other questions apply to the justice enterprise as a whole.

- What data, application, and communications standards are already in place at the state level?
- To what extent are state and local justice organizations in compliance with these standards?
- What resources currently are allocated to justice information sharing in the state?

**Appendix H:  
Sample Integration  
Newsletter**

(This two-page document is in a PDF file that will be supplied in the paper copies of the report.)